

THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

Editor: DOM BEDE WINSLOW

Associate Editor: DONALD ATTWATER

CONTENTS

| | | pages |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------|
| SPECIAL ISSUES OF THE E.C.Q. | <i>The Editor</i> | 361 |
| SYRIAN CHRISTIANS IN PALESTINE IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES | <i>Brother George Every, S.S.M.</i> | 363 |
| SOME NOTES ON THE WEST SYRIANS | <i>Father Stephen Rahhal</i> | 372 |
| THE PLIGHT OF THE LEBANON | <i>Michael Clark</i> | 381 |
| THE LITURGICAL PUBLICATIONS OF THE SACRED EASTERN CONGREGATION | <i>Father Cyril Korolevskij</i> | 388 |
| REVIEW OF REVIEWS | — | 399 |
| NEWS AND COMMENTS | — | 406 |
| RECENT PUBLICATIONS | — | 417 |
| OBITUARY | — | 427 |

SINGLE COPIES 2/- YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION 8/- POST FREE
U.S.A. AND CANADA 2 dollars

London Agents: Geo E. J. Coldwell, Ltd., 17 Red Lion Square, Holborn, London, W.C.1. to whom all subscriptions are to be paid, except those from U.S.A.

U.S.A. Agents: The Secretary, Catholic Near East Welfare Association, 480 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N.Y. Literary Communications, Exchanges, and Books for Review should be addressed to the Editor E.C.Q., St. Augustine's Abbey, Ramsgate.

THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

(Continuation of *Eastern Churches Number of "Pax,"*
founded 1931.)

VOL. VI

JULY-SEPTEMBER, 1946

No. 7

SPECIAL ISSUES OF THE E.C.Q.

ON the whole we have hitherto refrained from devoting one issue of the *Eastern Churches Quarterly* to the study of a special subject. When such a study demanded more than one article we treated the question in a series of articles spread out over the year in the several issues. This year, however, each issue is more or less devoted to some special problem. The reason is twofold. The first number was exclusively taken up with publishing the papers read at the Oxford Conference of October 1945. We do not intend to repeat this exclusion of all other matters from the contents. It is certainly useful to have all the papers in one issue, but now that we are not so limited by space, we intend to have the other usual items in the contents and so prevent the issue being entirely academic in character.

The other reason is mainly owing to force of circumstances. The present world crisis has brought certain problems which concern closely the Eastern Churches to the fore, and it is only by confronting these facts and changed conditions that one can understand the actual position in relation to Christian Unity. Hence we felt that, however tentative the attempt might be, one issue ought to be devoted to The Problem of Russia. This we have done in the last number, though there we have obviously only prepared the ground for future investigation.

This present issue is mainly devoted to painting in a background against which the problem of the Eastern Churches, in what has come to be known as the Middle East, can be treated. It is in these countries—Egypt, Syria, Palestine,

the Lebanon, Persia and Arabia—that the lesser Eastern Churches are grouped side by side with Churches of the Byzantine rite and the Latins. In the case of the Eastern Churches there are both Catholics and dissidents of the same rite, with the exception of the Maronites who are all Catholics. This means the intricacies of mixed nationalities and various ecclesiastical traditions with, in the case of the Catholics, the cross currents of Western influence; viz., there is the Melkite who is both a Syrian and has come under French culture, whereas the Catholic Copt has come under Italian culture and considers himself superior to the other Copts, and is very latinized. In addition there is the problem of the Church's approach to the Moslems. Three of the articles then are in the nature of remote or more recent historical background: viz., "Syrian Christians in the Early Middle Ages," "Notes on the West Syrians," and "The Plight of the Lebanon." In the News and Comments some of the present situation is dealt with.

In the last issue of this year (October-December) there will be some articles both about and by Ruthenian Catholics in the U.S.A. It is only right that at a time when their Mother Church is undergoing very severe persecution, which calls forth protest, sympathy and prayer on the part of all Catholics, we should take an interest both in the history and present position of the Ruthenians in the U.S.A. where they are the largest body of Catholics of the Oriental rite in that country.

We have to thank Dr. Willibald Ploechl, an Austrian Professor of Oriental Canon Law at the Catholic University of Washington for arranging the articles of this issue and for contributing himself.

There is also another reason why this issue is devoted to Catholics of the Oriental rite in the U.S.A. First it is by way of introduction to a closer study of the subject—because in the U.S.A. there is a considerable population of Christians of Oriental rites, so Catholic and dissident live side by side with a very large Catholic population of the Roman rite, hence in the U.S.A. the reunion of East and West is an actual and vital problem for the Church. And then as an act of gratitude to Mgr. Thomas McMahon and Father Andrew Rogosh, of the "Catholic Near East Welfare Association" at New York, since they have done, and are doing much to interest the American Catholic public in the *Eastern Churches Quarterly* and its ideals.

It does not follow that each future issue of the *Eastern Churches Quarterly* is going to be specialized in this way (though even in such an issue, News and Comments and The Review of Reviews leaves room for other matter), but it does mean that there will be special issues taking up the study of the problems that have been begun in these numbers, so keep this year's *Eastern Churches Quarterly* as a reference on your shelves.

THE EDITOR.

SYRIAN CHRISTIANS IN PALESTINE IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES¹

THIS paper is concerned with some problems in the history of the Church in Palestine from the ninth century to the twelfth. In the Patriarchate of Jerusalem the indigenous element is always half-hidden behind the crowds of pilgrims of every nationality, Anglo-Saxon, French, Spanish, Greek and Latin, Armenian, Georgian, Indian and Ethiopian, who not only flocked to the Holy Places but remained to pass their lives in penitence either in the local monasteries, or in hermitages of their own. In the Holy City the resident aliens often outnumbered the Christian natives of Jerusalem, but in Palestine taken as a whole,² the Syrians must always have been in a majority.

Their history is complicated by the various meanings attached to the term. In the Jacobite historians, Michael the Syrian and Gregory Bar-Hebraeus, who have had much influence on later Western writers, "Syrian Orthodox" are Jacobites. Armenians, who shared their Monophysitism, use the word in the same way. But Elias, the Nestorian bishop in Jerusalem, who in 893 became metropolitan of Damascus, wrote a "Tractatus de concordia fidei inter Syros"³ (so Assemani translates his title into Latin) in which he argues the fundamental unity of the three Syrian Christian Churches, Jacobites, Nestorians, and Melkites (Orthodox). In this case Syrians means Syriac-speaking Christians, as distinct from aliens. Chalcedonian writers, Greek and Latin, use

¹ This valuable article is by a member of the Anglican Community of Kelham.—EDITOR.

² For the use of Greek and Syriac in Palestine in the fourth century see *The Pilgrimage of Etheria*, Eng. trans., London, 1919, p. 94.

³ Summarized in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* III, pp. 513-6.

the term in a narrower sense of subjects of the Orthodox Patriarchate who sang their hours and liturgy in Syriac.

In this sense the term is used in the Latin *Commemoratorium de casis Dei*,¹ written in the ninth century to give an account of the working expenses of the Orthodox Patriarchate. There Syrians are distinguished from Greeks, Georgians, Latins, and from "one who sings psalms in Arabic." They have been claimed as Jacobites, but they are too closely associated with the Greeks and Georgians for this to be possible. The presence of Armenians in the *Commemoratorium* can be explained without supposing that all the Christians of Jerusalem, Orthodox and heretical, are comprehended in the same list. For according to an Armenian authority² they did not set up bishops outside Armenia until near the end of the tenth century. Their relations with the Orthodox in the Byzantine empire were not uniformly hostile until then. They may well have remained in communion with the patriarch of Jerusalem when they were on political grounds in schism with Byzantium.

A copy of the rule of St. Sabbas, an important monastery in Palestine, made in the twelfth or possibly in the thirteenth century, and now preserved on Sinai,³ provides further evidence of the narrower use of the term Syrian. In the monastery were Greek, Syrian, Georgian, and "Frankish" monks, who said their offices and sang the first part of the liturgy in their own speech at their own churches, but came together in the great church of the Greeks for the liturgy of the faithful. The two principal nations were "Romans" (Greeks) and "Syrians." Syrians appear in the same sense in Latin descriptions of the Holy Land by John of Wurzburg⁴ and Theodorich,⁵ who both wrote about 1170, and distinguish Syrian monks from Jacobites and Nestorians. The distinction is most clearly explained by Jacques de Vitry, who in his *Abbreviated History of Jerusalem* (1220)⁶ associates the *Syriani* with the Greeks, and contrasts them sharply with the Jacobites,

¹ In T. Tobler and A. Molinier, *Itinera Hierosolymitana et Descriptiones Terrae Sanctae*, Vol. I, Latina, Geneva, 1879, pp. 301-5.

² M. Ormanian, *The Armenian Church*, Eng. trans., London, 1912, p. 49.

³ *Cod. Sinai*. 1096, cited by E. Kurtz in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, III (1894), pp. 168-70. In the fifteenth century copy, *Cod. Sinai*. 531, the Franks are omitted.

⁴ *Patrologia Latina* 155 c. 1088; Eng. trans. from another text in *Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society*, Vol. V, No. 14, p. 69.

⁵ *Ibid.*, No. 17, p. 14.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Vol. XI, No. 31, pp. 68-76.

who were political allies of the Latins, especially at the time of the second Latin occupation of Jerusalem from 1229-39¹.

In the light of these instances it may be reasonable to assume that where "Syri" or "Syriani" are associated with Greeks, Georgians, and Latins the Syriac-liturgizing members of the Orthodox Melkite community are meant, as for instance in the very interesting accounts of the coming of the Holy Fire in 1101 found in Latin and Armenian sources,² and in several other references to joint processions of Latins, Greeks, and Syrians.

The only other Christian community who could possibly be intended in most of these instances are the Jacobites, for Maronites were seldom found outside the Lebanon, and the Nestorians were strangers in Jerusalem. That there was a Jacobite community in Jerusalem in the twelfth century is clear from a number of passages in Jacobite, Armenian and Latin writers, but its history before that time is very obscure.³ It is clear from Bar-Hebraeus and Michael the Syrian that the centres of Jacobitism in the Middle Ages were in Asia Minor around Melitene, in Syria, in Cilicia, and in Northern Mesopotamia. There were Jacobites in the Lebanon, but very few in Palestine, where the only Jacobite sees were at Acre and Jerusalem.⁴ At Jerusalem the Jacobite bishop never ranked as a patriarch, and it is not improbable that his flock, who came into conflict with "the inhabitants of Jerusalem" over the date of Easter in 1102,⁵ was composed of immigrants from Edessa, who may have arrived in the train of King Baldwin, Count of Edessa from 1098-1100. More Jacobites and Nestorians came from the north and east, and Copts and Ethiopians from the south, to take the place of the Franks when Saladin expelled them from Jerusalem in 1187. But in the thirteenth century Bar-Hebraeus notes as remarkable

¹ For this alliance see especially Bar-Hebraeus, *Chronicon Ecclesiasticon*, ed. Louvain, Vol. I, 1872, c. 653-64.

² The evidence is summarized in an article by H. Hagenmeyer in *Revue de l'orient Latin* IX (1902), pp. 419-22; cf. especially Matthew of Edessa, in *Bibliothèque historique Armenienne*, ed. by E. Dulaquier, Paris, 1858, pp. 233-4, and an extract from Fulcher of Chartres in *Palestine Pilgrims' Texts*, Vol. IV, No. 6, pp. 106-8.

³ See J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, Vol. II, p. 374, and the notes, by J.-B. Abbeloos and T. J. Lamy, to Bar-Hebraeus, *Chron. Eccles.* Vol. I, c. 657-8.

⁴ See the list by E. Rey in *Revue de l'orient Latin*, VIII (1901), p. 150.

⁵ See Matthew of Edessa in *Bibl. Arm.*, p. 251, Michael the Syrian, *Chronique*, ed. and trans. J.-B. Chabot, Vol. III, Paris, 1911, p. 190.

the presence of seventy Jacobite monks in Jerusalem.¹ The community needed Latin protection to resist a Coptic ecclesiastical invasion in 1237.

The scanty remains of Christian literature in the Palestinian dialect of Syriac are entirely Orthodox.² This is not the only literature in Syriac associated with Orthodox Christians in Palestine, for at least one (No. 129) of the numerous manuscripts in Edessene Syriac in the library of St. Catherine's monastery on Sinai is said to follow the use of Jerusalem. Though a few of these manuscripts have been definitely classified as Jacobite or Maronite, it seems most probable that many of them are Orthodox, since the library was collected for liturgical and devotional use, not primarily for study. An examination of their provenance in detail might reveal as many from Palestine as from northern Syria. The single manuscript from Jerusalem is enough to prove that some Palestinians liturgized in the literary Syriac that is generally associated with the literature of the Jacobite, Nestorian, and Maronite churches. It seems to be at least possible that some liturgical manuscripts in European libraries hitherto classified as Jacobite or Maronite may belong to Palestinian or Syrian Melkites.

Other Syrians liturgized in Greek at the Greek monasteries. To Benjamin of Tudela, a Jewish observer in 1168³, the monks of Sinai are "Syrians." At St. Sabbas the Syrian monks completed the liturgy in Greek. The poverty of Orthodox Christian literature in either form of Syriac is easily explained by the concourse of scholars to the Greek choirs. At Saint Sabbas no "Syrian" might be hegoumen. It does not in the least follow that all "Romans" were immigrants from the Byzantine empire or from Greek-speaking communities on the coast of Syria. Many would-be Palestinians who turned "Roman" to read Greek books. In the case of Said Ibn Batrik, who from 933 to 940 was the Melkite Patriarch Eutychius of Alexandria, we have a clear instance of a Melkite author who liturgized in Greek, but wrote history in Arabic. The combination of Greek and Arabic learning is found as early as the eighth century in

¹ *Chron. Eccles.*, II, c. 653-4.

² See F. C. Burkitt in *Journal of theological studies*, II (1901), p. 175, XXIV (1923), p. 418, A. S. Lewis, *Catalogue of the Syriac MSS in the Convent of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai*, Cambridge, 1894, p. 93, *A Palestinian Syriac Lectionary*, Cambridge, 1897.

³ In. T. Wright, *Early Travels in Palestine*, London, 1848, p. 123.

St. John of Damascus, who had an Arabic name, Mansur, and served in the finance department of the Caliph's service. His disciple Theodore Abu Qurra wrote Arabic theological works.¹ Later instances include the continuator of Eutychius, Yah'ya Ibn Said al-Antaki who died about 1040,² and probably Anastasius of Caesarea at the end of the eleventh century.³

These Melkites would count as "Romans," but they were neither Greeks nor Byzantine subjects. Their sympathies in liturgy and doctrine did not always follow the movements of opinion in the Byzantine empire. According to Said Ibn Batrik the patriarch of Constantinople was not commemorated in the diptychs of Alexandria, Antioch, or Jerusalem from the Arab conquest to 937.⁴ Yah'ya agrees, and says that communications with the West were so uncertain that the name of Pope Benedict II (684-5) remained in the diptychs without a successor until 999⁵. No doubt they improved at the end of the tenth century, when the Byzantines occupied Antioch and Aleppo, and the Moslem states were weak and divided. But in 1054 the patriarch Michael Cerularius of Constantinople had difficulty in communicating directly with Alexandria or Jerusalem. He had heard, and seemed to believe, that the churches there celebrated the eucharist at least occasionally in unleavened bread, contrary to the Byzantine usage.⁶ His Latin adversary, Cardinal Humbert, confirmed the intelligence with fuller details, and made distinctions between Greeks and others at Jerusalem.⁷ From this it would appear that too much significance should not be attached to the so-called "Byzantine protectorate" over the Holy Places in the middle of the eleventh century. Moslem rulers may have allowed the Byzantine emperors to repair the church of the Holy Sepulchre, and even to appoint the patriarch of

¹ See G. Graf, *Die Christliche Arabische Literatur*, Freiburg, 1905, pp. 31-7.

² See *ibid.*, pp. 40-2. Eutychius and Yah'ya were published together in Arabic, two Vols., ed. by P. L. Cheikho and others, Beirut and Paris, 1909-12; Eutychius in the Latin of Edward Pocock in P.G. III, c. 903-1156; two parts of Yah'ya in *Patrologia Orientalis*, XVIII, 5, and XXIII, 3.

³ Greek works in P.G. 127.

⁴ Arabic, Vol. II, pp. 87-8, P.G. III, c. 1156.

⁵ P.O. XVIII, 5, pp. 707-9.

⁶ P.G. 120, c. 787-90.

⁷ P.L. 143 c. 951-2; for comment on the use of unleavened bread in Syria see A. Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios*, Vol. II, Paderborn, 1930, pp. 116-8.

Jerusalem.¹ But there was as yet no complete assimilation between the liturgies of Jerusalem and Constantinople.

Liturgical differences are again noticed by the Byzantine canonist Theodore Balsamon at the end of the twelfth century. His replies to questions raised by the patriarch Mark of Alexandria are generally dated in about 1194, but more probably belong before 1191, for in another passage in his works, where he refers to Mark's visit to Constantinople as to a past event,² he clearly assigns it to a period when his own word was law in the eyes of the Emperor Isaac Angelus. But according to Nicetas Choniates, a contemporary historian and publicist,³ Isaac passed over Balsamon for the Patriarchate of Constantinople in 1191, and appointed Dositheus of Jerusalem instead, to his bitter chagrin. Balsamon's encounter with Mark may plausibly be connected with negotiations in 1187-9 between the Byzantines and the Sultan of Egypt. These probably resulted in an increase of Byzantine influence among the Melkites under the Moslems in Egypt and Syria, reflected in some fresh infiltrations of material from the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom into the liturgies of St. Mark and St. James.⁴ But these stop short of Balsamon's demand for complete liturgical uniformity. Some time after the controversy first began he was still complaining of the continued use of St. Mark and St. James in Egypt and Palestine, and of the liturgical aberrations of the Georgians, who put no water in the sacramental wine.⁵ There is no reason to see in the end of the twelfth century a *terminus ad quem* for the final triumph of the Byzantine liturgy in the East. When the liturgies of St. James and St. Mark became merely relics of the past, fossils surviving from an earlier period, their development naturally ceased. While they were still being changed to suit the habits of those who at other times used St. John Chrysostom we may presume that St. James was

¹ William of Tyre in P.L. 201, c. 450; see also A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, Eng. trans., Vol. I, Madison, 1928, p. 380, citing Yah'ya and another Arabic historian, Ibn-al-Athir.

² P.G. 137, c. 621. The questions and answers themselves are in P.G. 138, . 953 ff.

³ *History*, ed. I. Bekker, Bonn, 1835, p. 529. See also the text cited in A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Ἀνδεκτα τῆς Ἱεροσαλύμιτικῆς σταχνολογίας*, Vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1894, pp. 362-70.

⁴ See F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, pp. 1, lxiv, and the texts cited in C. A. Swainson, *The Greek Liturgies*, Cambridge, 1884, pp. 2-73 and 215-332.

⁵ P.G. 137, c. 621.

still, as Balsamon says, used on festivals in the churches around Jerusalem.

Byzantine influence upon this liturgy began before the Arab invasion. We may presume that it again operated between 937 and 1071, especially in the middle of the eleventh century, when the Byzantines paid for repairs in the Holy Places. It may well be that the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom then began to be used widely, not only in those churches and monasteries served by Byzantine immigrants. But as we shall see a distinction must be made, which is seldom sufficiently observed, between Byzantine influence at Antioch and at Alexandria or Jerusalem.

Antioch was in the Byzantine empire from 969 to 1085. The Greeks there were citizens of a Greek city, who still regarded themselves as Byzantine subjects when they were conquered by the Turks in 1085 and by the Normans in 1098. They resented the rule of Latin patriarchs imposed upon them by their Norman princes from 1100 to 1268, and on at least two occasions, in 1165-70 and 1207-13, succeeded in extorting from their rulers the installation of a Greek patriarch instead. In their struggle against Latin ecclesiastical and secular domination they received diplomatic, and at times military support from Byzantium¹. The Greeks or "Romans" of Jerusalem and Palestine were mainly Syrians who resorted to the Greek choirs in search of learning. When the conflict at Antioch was at its height they seem to have remained at peace with the Latins, for in 1169 the Syrian artist Ephrem made or restored mosaics, with Greek inscriptions in the Byzantine manner, for the Anglo-Norman bishop Raoul, in the church of the Nativity at Bethlehem.² At about the same time the monks of Saint Sabbas received endowments to pray for the soul of the Latin Queen Melisenda, whose mother was a Syrian³. Descriptions of the Holy Places that have already been cited from John of Wurzburg and Theodorich point to general harmony at Jerusalem between many nations, Greeks, Latins, Armenians, Georgians, Germans, and Russians. Russian pilgrims who came to Jerusalem

¹ See E. Rey in *Revue de l'orient Latin*, VIII (1901), pp. 136, 139, 147, 150, Michael the Syrian, *Chronique*, Vol. III, pp. 336-9, the letters of Innocent III in P.L. 215, c. 1322, 1345, P.L. 216, c. 434, and A. Luchaire, *Innocent III : la question d'orient*, Paris, 1907, pp. 37-42, 50-2.

² See T.S.R. Boase in *Journal of the Warburg Institute*, II (1938), pp. 12-4, and H. Stern in *Byzantion* XI (1936), pp. 100-52.

³ P.L. 155, c. 1229, 1235.

to visit the Greek and Syrian monasteries were received by the Latin king and the Latin patriarch.¹

A sociological basis for this unity may be found in a Syrian Melkite majority in the Orthodox church of Jerusalem, which had of old comprehended Syrians, Greeks or "Romans," Latins, and Georgians, as envisaged in the *Commemoratorium de casis Dei* and the rule of Saint Sabbas. The Syrians, the Georgians, and the native-born element among the "Romans" had never been directly involved in the quarrels between Rome and Constantinople that began to come to a head in the middle of the eleventh century. Their theological traditions were oriental, and in their scheme of decoration at Bethlehem they inscribed the Eastern doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost,² but they accepted the Latin Patriarch and the Latin bishops as the natural rulers of the church, while the Franks remained rulers of the country from 1099 to 1187.

We might expect that other views would be held in desert monasteries beyond the borders of the Latin kingdom, and under the political sway of the Egyptians. And indeed there is liturgical evidence that patriarchs "of all the churches of Sion," who were established in Constantinople³ in the second half of the twelfth century were recognized on Sinai.⁴ M. Lequien⁵ believed that their appointment was a diplomatic move on the part of the Byzantine government with a view to the struggle between Greek and Latin elements at Antioch. The attempts of Greek controversialists to connect them with the patriarchs before the First Crusade are halting and unconvincing. It may be that the Byzantines did not take their claims very seriously, since the Byzantine emperor certainly contributed to the decoration of the church at Bethlehem, and gave gifts to the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, while the Latins remained in possession⁶ Titular patriarchs

¹ The record of the Abbess Euphrosyne of Polotsk (c. 1170) is in *Revue de l'orient Latin* III (1895), pp. 32-5; cf. also the narrative of the Abbot Daniel (1113-5) in *Palestine Pilgrims' Texts*, Vol. IV, No. 6.

² See the inscription commemorating the Second Oecumenical Council quoted in full in *Byzantion* XIII (1938), p. 422.

³ See Nicetas Choniates, *Thesaurus Orthodoxae Fidei*, P.G. 140, c. 180 257.

⁴ *Cod. Sinai*, 1040, a fourteenth century copy of a text that may be dated in about 1166. The diptychs are printed in *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, pp. 500-1.

⁵ *Oriens Christiana* III, c. 502.

⁶ See the Greek description of the Holy Places by John Phocas in P.G. 133, c. 927 62, and the obituary notice of the Emperor Manuel by William of Tyre in P.L. 201, c. 851.

of Jerusalem were a possible alternative to the Latins. As such they were invited to the Holy City by Saladin, who after he took Jerusalem in 1187 opened negotiations with the Byzantine emperor Isaac Angelus, on the basis of toleration for Greek and Syrian, but not Latin Christians.¹ These negotiations probably afforded the occasion for Balsamon's comments on the irregularities of Palestinian, Egyptian, and Georgian Melkites.

The capture of Jerusalem by Saladin opens a new period in the history of the church in Palestine. Though the Franks held points on the coast for another hundred years, and for a time reoccupied Jerusalem, their power in the interior was henceforth contested by powerful Moslem adversaries, who had every interest in separating the Syrian Christians from their communion. Moreover the sympathies of the Syrians must necessarily have been affected by the contemporary struggle between Greeks and Latins in Cyprus and in the main body of the Byzantine empire. The Maronites, who had submitted to the Latin patriarch of Antioch in 1182, continued to be the loyal allies of the Latins. Some of them moved to Cyprus to help them against the Greeks. Relations between Latins and Jacobites seem to have remained friendly, or become more intimate. A Jacobite party submitted to the Latins in about 1183, and others followed, at least for a time, in the thirteenth century². But the Melkites, Syrian, Greek, and Georgian, must inevitably have sympathized with the sufferings of the Cypriotes, whom the Frankish conquerors of Cyprus kept under iron control, both civil and ecclesiastical, for fear of a Greek rising. Cyprus, like Antioch, was a Byzantine possession.

The war in Cyprus merged in a general war over the body of the Byzantine empire, which began in 1203 and lasted even after the capture of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453. Friction between Greeks and Latins was common enough in the twelfth century, but its gravity is often exaggerated by those who read back the sentiments engendered by this general war into the earlier period. Through the greater part of the reign of the Emperor Manuel, from 1143 to 1180, the Byzantines were closely allied to important parties among the Latins of Italy and Syria. There was no

¹ See the references in F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserhunden des Oströmischen Reiches*, Vol. II, Munich and Berlin, 1925, Nos. 1585, 1591, 1593 (1189).

² Bar-Hebraeus, *Chron. Eccles.*, I, c. 584, 653-64.

scenes of violence between Greek and Latin pilgrims at Jerusalem. It is to say the least very doubtful whether the schism between Rome and Constantinople that began in the eleventh century had yet interrupted communion at the Holy Places.¹ The interruption came with the expulsion of the Latins from Jerusalem in 1187.

GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

SOME NOTES ON THE WEST SYRIANS²

I. THE SYRIAC LANGUAGE.

THE Syrians properly use the Syriac language for their official public prayer; but some Arabic is tolerated³, because many of the people have, since the Arab conquest, lost their own ancient tongue. Until the Moslems came to Syria, Aramaic was the native language of the peoples of the Near East from the valley of the Nile⁴ to the Taurus mountains and the

¹ A new interpretation of the nature and development of the great schism will be found in my book, *The Byzantine Patriarchate, 451-1204*, to be published by the S.P.C.K. for the Church Historical Society.

² Translated and annotated by Dom Benedict Morrison.

³ Where Arabic is spoken. Malayalam is used for the vernacular parts in Malabar, and Turkish, Kurdish and some modern Aramaic dialects by certain groups of Jacobites in Turkey and 'Iraq (TRANSLATOR).

⁴ The native language in Egypt was of course Coptic; but there was a large Jacobite colony at the monastery of our Lady of the Syrians at Skete in the Nitrian Valley. Syriac belongs to the Eastern group of Aramaic dialects, became a literary language at Edessa (whose evangelization began during the second half of the second century), and eventually supplanted all other dialects as a liturgical and literary language among all (or nearly all) Aramaic-speaking Christians. Some of these Aramaic dialects are still spoken in some places. It should also be remembered that Greek was the official and dominating language in such centres as Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem until some time after the Arab conquest. Until the christological controversies of the fifth and sixth centuries, Greek was the principal liturgical language in Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem and other hellenized centres, but in Syria and Palestine the lessons and the homily of the bishop were translated into Aramaic for the benefit of those who did not understand Greek. In country churches the services were probably entirely in Aramaic. When the monophysites of the patriarchate of Antioch were organized as a separated church, Syriac was adopted as the official language to the exclusion of Greek, although Greek studies were held in high esteem among the Jacobites of the sixth, seventh and following centuries, and a number of their liturgical texts are translations from the Greek. (TRANSLATOR).

Persian Gulf. And Syrian missionaries¹ carried the Syriac tongue to India, China and Mongolia.

Today Syriac is used in public worship not only by the Catholic and the Jacobite Syrians, but also by the Maronites, by the Catholic Chaldeans and the Nestorians in 'Iraq and elsewhere, and by all the corresponding Christians in Malabar in India.

The Syrian liturgical repertory counts about a thousand melodies. This treasury of religious music has been handed down by oral tradition for centuries. Certain hymns go back to Saint Ephrem, who died in 373. This musical treasure was in danger of being lost or substantially altered. But now the Benedictines have undertaken to transcribe these melodies in modern musical notation (written from right to left, on account of the Syriac text); and they have been published by the Jesuit press in Beirut (l'Imprimerie Catholique) in a volume of about 700 pages, *Mélodies Liturgiques Syriennes et Chaldéennes*. The first two volumes deal with the Syrian melodies. The first volume contains a musical introduction by the late Dom Jules Jeannin, of Haute-Combe Abbey. The second volume contains a liturgical introduction by Dom Anselm Chibas-Lassalle, titular abbot of our Lady of the Valley of Josaphat and prior of the monastery of the Mount of Olives, followed by the collection of the Syrian melodies. The third volume, containing the Chaldaean melodies, has not yet appeared.

II. THE SYRIAN JACOBITES.

The Jacobite Church was born of a religious schism complicated by nationalist separatism. A little before 450 Eutyches, archimandrite of a monastery in Constantinople, spread erroneous doctrines concerning Christ, saying that the two natures, divine and human, were confounded. This heresy (Monophysism) was condemned by the oecumenical Council of Chalcedon in 451. The emperors at Constantinople upheld the decision of the Council and wanted to impose it by force: this was the signal for a general revolt; the Armenians, Syrians, Copts and Ethiopians refused to submit to the orders of Byzantium.

Those Syrians who accepted the doctrine upheld by the Emperor were nicknamed "Melkites" ("Emperor's men," from the Syriac *malko* or *malka* = King).

¹ i.e., East Syrians or Nestorians (TRANSLATOR).

The monophysites were mercilessly persecuted by the imperial agents ; their hierarchy would have been annihilated had it not been for a certain James Baradai (or Zauzalos), that is to say, James "the ragged," who, disguised as a beggar and by trickery, had himself consecrated bishop;¹ it was he who organized the monophysite clergy among the Syrians ; hence the nickname of "Jacobites."²

The Patriarch. The patriarch is the supreme religious head of the Church. During the time of the Ottoman empire he wielded considerable authority over his flock, even in civil matters, the religious minority being complicated by an ethnic minority ; and as a trace of this state of affairs, matrimonial questions are still regulated by the religious head of each confession.

The patriarch is elected by the synod of bishops, but after the faithful have been consulted. Under the Ottomans, the assembly of bishops submitted to the Sultan a list of three candidates who had obtained the majority of the votes ; generally the Sultan granted or refused his consent according as the sum paid by the candidate was considered sufficient or otherwise. He who received the *firman*, or letter of confirmation, was enthroned during a religious ceremony.

The Jacobite patriarch takes the title of Patriarch of Antioch, but his residence was formerly at Diarbakir, or Amida in Turkey. In 1080, the patriarchal see was fixed at Dair-az-Za'pharan, near Mardin. The present patriarchy, Mar Ignatius Afrem Barsaum, resides at Homs (Emesa) in Syria.

The *Maphrian* ("Fruitful") is an archbishop enjoying wide prerogatives : he holds the first place after the patriarch ; it is a purely honorary title, and the patriarch has the power to withdraw it. The maphrian was originally the Jacobite counterpart of the Nestorian *Katholikos* in eastern Mesopotamia and Persia, which he governed in the name of the patriarch.

¹ Thanks to the Empress Theodora, who was a convinced monophysite, although she was the wife of such a staunch defender of Chalcedonian orthodoxy as the Emperor Justinian (TRANSLATOR).

² The intruder Severus was installed as monophysite patriarch of Antioch on 6th Nov., 512, and was banished on 20th Sept., 518 ; but his partisans always considered him as the lawful patriarch. On his death they appointed to succeed him Sergius of Tella (538-40). In 543 or 544 James Baradai consecrated, as monophysite patriarch of Antioch, Paul of Beith Ukarin, who was consequently the first of the line of Jacobite patriarchs. The date of the foundation of the Jacobite Church is therefore 543-44 (TRANSLATOR):

Metropolitans and Bishops (in Arabic, *Mutrān*; plural, *Matārin*). These are chosen necessarily from among the monks because the latter are celibate, whereas the parish clergy must be married. The lower clergy and the people have only a consultative vote, but the latter have a considerable influence on the episcopal college, to say nothing of the intrigues and the sums of money which are distributed. Ignorance is the general lot of the Jacobite episcopate.¹

Parish clergy. The parish priests are married. Orders are conferred on anyone of the faithful if he can read Syriac and Arabic², especially if he has a fine voice and an imposing presence.

Monks. Monastic life, formerly flourishing, is today completely degenerate among the Jacobites; there are twenty monks at the most. Formerly they possessed numerous monasteries; a dozen remain (most of them empty of monks), of which the most famous are: Dair-ez-Za'pharan, near Mardin in Turkey, the official seat of the patriarch. A handful of monks are finishing their days there; Dair Mar Matta (called "the Old"), near Mosul ('Iraq); where a few monks live a kind of life which recalls the monastic regime of the fourth century: numerous fasts, prolonged offices, no outside apostolate or intellectual activity; and Mar Morcos (Saint Mark's) in Jerusalem. This monastery is one of the old Christian sites of the Holy City; five monks reside there with a bishop, and officiate at the little chapel behind the Holy Sepulchre called the "Tomb of Nicodemus."

The Jacobite Faithful. Without counting the Syrians of Malabar in India,³ the Jacobite faithful exceed a hundred thousand; it is little when one thinks of their numbers as the time of the Arab conquest. In hatred of the Byzantines who oppressed them on account of their beliefs, the Jacobites lent a helping hand to the invaders and the khalifs were grateful for their aid; but later Moslem fanaticism got the upper hand, and they were decimated by periodical massacre.

The principal centres are: 'Iraq, Turkey, Kurdistan,

¹ The present patriarch, who was educated at the Dominican Syro-Chaldaean preparatory seminary at Mosul, and then reverted to Jacobitism, is an exception (TRANSLATOR).

² Provided both he and his wife have been married only once, for second marriages are a canonical impediment to the reception of the diaconate and the priesthood in the East (TRANSLATOR).

³ The Jacobites of Malabar are about 300,000. The "Syrian" or "St. Thomas" Christians of Malabar are native Indians, and their language Malayalam, is Dravidian (TRANSLATOR).

Syria, the Lebanon, Palestine; one should note also the emigrant colonies in Egypt and in the two Americas, especially in Latin America.

The Syrian Jacobites, especially those of the old generation, are apparently very religious. But their piety is naif, with a certain amount of superstition, and they are more attached to their ancestral traditions than to the essentials of religion. Religious conviction is diminishing among the young generation, which is becoming affected by Protestantism but is more attached to the ideal of an extra-religious Syrian nationalism based on the national language, Syriac.

The Jacobites in Palestine. In the fourteenth century, in Jerusalem alone the Syrian Jacobites numbered more than 30,000 faithful, and they possessed numerous monasteries in different parts of Palestine. At present their numbers are, in Jerusalem, 1,500 souls, in Bethlehem, 750, and 300 dispersed in different localities.

In Jerusalem they have the monastery of Saint Mark with its mediaeval church; not far from the monastery is a chapel dedicated in honour of Mar Behnam, martyr, and in the basilica of the Holy Sepulchre there is the chapel of Saint Nicodemus, disciple of Christ. In Bethlehem they have a new parish church, recently consecrated, dedicated in honour of our Lady. On the banks of the Jordan there is a chapel with residence and cultivated land.

Schools are in Jerusalem, in the quarter called "Moscobiyyeh," an elementary school. The programme includes Syriac, Arabic and English. It is a mixed school which receives about 150 children of both sexes; and in Bethlehem, an elementary school, with the same programme, near the parish church. There are 100 pupils.

The Jacobite clergy in Palestine are, in Jerusalem, besides the bishop and the five monks who reside at Saint Mark's monastery, two married priests who live in private houses. Being married they are not able to live with their wives among the celibate monks, and are not even allowed to celebrate the eucharistic liturgy in the monastery church: they celebrate outside. In Bethlehem, there is a parish priest, of course married.

III. THE CATHOLIC SYRIANS.

The Catholic Syrians are those of the Jacobites who have abandoned their schism and been reunited to Rome. The reunion movement began at the time of the Crusades, but

it then gave no lasting fruits, on account of the departure of the crusaders. Since the sixteenth century the movement towards union has become more effective. In the eighteenth century the Catholic Syrians, despite the Moslems and the Jacobites, and thanks to the zeal of Capuchin and Jesuit missionaries and the protection of the consuls of France, were constituted as an autonomous church, with a complete hierarchy corresponding to that of the Jacobites.

The two Syrian branches differ on a few points of doctrine. There is almost complete identity as regards language, which is Syriac, as well as regards the eucharistic liturgy, the sacraments and the Divine Office.¹

The following are briefly the chief points of doctrinal difference:—The Jacobites do not recognize the two natures in Jesus Christ. It is in their case a matter of misunderstanding and respect for their own tradition.² They are schismatic (materially) or separated, because they refuse to recognize the supreme authority of the Pope of Rome over the Universal Church. They do not accept the term “Purgatory” for the place in the next world where souls undergo temporal purification before enjoying the Beatific Vision. It is a simple disagreement about words: their liturgical texts are full of prayers for the dead.

The Catholic Patriarch. He is elected by the synod or plenary assembly of the bishops of the rite. Once elected, he cannot be enthroned before he has been approved by the Holy See; this approbation is notified by the sending of the pallium. The election is made by secret vote or by acclamation, as was the case for Cardinal Tappuni, the present patriarch. He is then the religious head of the rite under the supreme authority of the Pope (the Catholic Syrians have no maphrian), and bears the title of “Patriarch of Antioch, the City of God.” At the beginning of the move-

¹ The Catholic Syrians have adopted the Roman form, translated into Syriac and Arabic, for the sacrament of Penance. The West Syrian or Syro-Antiochene rite is a combination of the former Syro-Palestinian and Edessene rites. Its fundamental anaphora, called “of Mar James, Brother of Our Lord,” originated in Jerusalem. The Syriac text in use is a translation from the Greek (TRANSLATOR).

² Theirs is the verbal monophysism of Severus of Antioch. They condemn Eutyches and say that our Lord is perfect God and perfect Man. But they reject the Tome of Pope Saint Leo the Great and the Council of Chalcedon, and refuse to admit the expression: “One Person in two natures” (*μία ὑπόστασις ἐν δύο φύσεσιν*). Gregory Bar-Hebraeus (d. 1286) says: “That one nature is double and not simple.” Assemani, B.O. II, 297 (TRANSLATOR).

ment towards Rome, the Catholic patriarchs fixed their residence temporarily at Aleppo ; they established themselves later at Mardin, opposite the Jacobites, not without much opposition. In 1898, Mar Efrem Rahmani, for administrative reasons, transferred to Beirut, with the consent of Rome, and Cardinal Tappuni has built a residence there, seeing that it was impossible to return to Mardin on account of the Turkish government.

Archbishops and Bishops. They are elected by the college of bishops assembled in synod, under the presidency of the patriarch. The clergy and faithful of the diocese to be provided for are invited by the assembly of bishops to present a list of three candidates ; the bishops choose one or may reject the whole list ; they then ask for a second list, and this may be done thrice. If the third time the candidates presented do not seem to offer the conditions required by canon law, the synod chooses any man whom it judges to be worthy. The elect cannot be consecrated without having received the approbation of the Holy See, which orders a serious enquiry to be made concerning him.

The Dioceses. The Catholic Syrian dioceses are the same, or almost the same, as those of the Jacobites. They are : *Mardin* in Turkey, formerly the patriarchal see. Today it is administered by a patriarchal vicar having the dignity of *Chorepiscopus*. The Syrians continue to emigrate to Northern Syria, on account of the vexatious attitude of the Turkish government. *Upper Gezireh*, in Northern Syria. This diocese is ruled by an episcopal patriarchal vicar. The faithful are refugees from Turkey. The archdioceses of *Mosul* and *Baghdad*. These two great centres comprise many villages inhabited only by Syrians. The archdiocese of *Aleppo*. On account of immigration, this has become a very important centre of Catholic Syrians. *Homs* (*Emesa*) and *Hama* in Syria. There are numerous villages in which the Syrians alone form the whole population. The Jacobites are still in the majority. The archdiocese of *Damascus*. This is a big diocese, and was one of the first centres to turn towards Catholicism. *Bairut*. There is a patriarchal vicar, with episcopal character, for the Lebanon, where immigration has introduced a fairly thickly populated Syrian agglomeration. There are at present also two titular archbishops who reside with the patriarch. *Cairo*. Residence of the episcopal patriarchal vicar in Egypt. The Syrians are not very numerous there, but they are in easy circumstances and sometimes very

rich. *Jerusalem*. Episcopal see administered by a patriarchal vicar with the dignity of *Chorepiscopius*.

Pastoral clergy. The Syrian rite at present comprises 135 priests, all celibate with three or four exceptions. Nearly all of these priests have been formed in houses of clerical education such as the Oriental (inter-ritual) seminary of the Jesuits at Beirut; the Syro-Chaldaean seminary of the Dominicans, at Mosul, which trained Cardinal Tappuni; the Propaganda College in Rome¹; the seminary of the Capuchins, in Constantinople; the preparatory seminary of the Benedictines, of the French province of the Cassinese Congregation of the Primitive Observance at Jerusalem (Mount of Olives); and the patriarchal senior seminary, also under the direction of these Benedictines, at Sharfeh, Dar un-Harissa, in the Lebanon, which is the patriarchal summer residence.

Regular clergy. The rite has now no religious congregation, but a few parishes are served by monks, survivors of a congregation, the Brothers of Saint Ephrem, which was begun at Mardin before 1914. The Benedictines of the Syrian seminary of Jerusalem, besides assuring the formation of the secular clergy, have created a Syrian monastic branch under the Rule of Saint Benedict. It is an understood thing that the Syro-Benedictine monks (that is their official name) shall keep their own language and their liturgical traditions.

The Catholic Syrians nevertheless possess several monasteries, some of which go back to a remote antiquity. The most remarkable are: *Mar Behnam*, near Mosul, which contains the tomb of the royal boy-martyr. The church is a monument of Eastern Christian art, and certain parts go back to the fourth century. The Convent is governed by a superior of the secular clergy. *Mar Musa (Moses) the Ethiopian*, 70 kilometers north of Damascus, on the road to Homs. This building is empty and tottering. In the chapel, which may go back to the seventh century, are frescoes of exquisite beauty, interesting specimens of Syrian art. *Mar Afrem (Ephrem) of Raghem*, near Hammana in the Lebanon. Built in the fifteenth century, this was formerly inhabited by monks, who had an abbot who was also a bishop. During the Druse rising in 1860, the monks were massacred, and the building was ransacked and burnt. The dead themselves were disinterred and thrown into the fire, and their ashes

¹ A few priests have studied also at the Pontifical Oriental Institute at Rome (TRANSLATOR).

scattered. Since that time the monastery remains abandoned, as there are so many ruins to build up elsewhere, and resources are lacking. *Sharfeh* (Convent-seminary of *our Lady of Deliverance*). Founded in the eighteenth century by the Patriarch Ignatius Michael Jarweh.

The Catholic Syrian faithful number about 60,000. Their chief centres are in Iraq, Syria and the Lebanon. One should mention also several colonies of emigrants in America, especially in Latin America, where the Syrians sought bread and safety from persecution.

In Malabar (South India). Since 1930 a strong movement in favour of union with Rome has developed among the Jacobites of Malabar, following the reconciliation of two Jacobite bishops, Mar Ivanios and Mar Theophilos. At present, the Catholic West Syrian church of Malabar (called Malankarese) has one resident archbishop or metropolitan (of Trivandrum), one resident suffragan bishop (of Tiruvalla), two other bishops, 98 secular clergy; two religious congregations, the Brothers and Sisters of the Imitation of Christ founded by Mar Ivanios of Trivandrum; and more than 50,000 faithful. The new converts with their hierarchy depend directly on Rome, and have nothing in common with the Catholic Syrians of western Asia except their rite and its liturgical language.

In Palestine the Catholic Syrians comprise, in Jerusalem, the patriarchal vicar, in Bethlehem, a parish priest, and in the Benedictine seminary on the Mount of Olives two secular priests who are professors of Syriac and Arabic, as well as the first priest-monk of the new Syro-Benedictine branch in course of formation.

The Catholic Syrians have in Jerusalem a residence for the patriarchal vicar, with a small chapel; and in Bethlehem there is a new church, dedicated in 1930, with a residence for the parish priest. Each of these parishes had formerly an elementary school, but both had to be closed through lack of funds.

The Benedictine Syrian Seminary. At the request of the Patriarch Rahmani, Pope Leo XIII entrusted to the Benedictines of the French province of the Cassinese Congregation of the Primitive Observance the mission of forming the Catholic Syrian clergy. Their seminary at Jerusalem was opened in 1903, but owing to lack of resources it has not yet been possible to build a church in conformity with the West Syrian rite. In 1930 the seminary of Sharfeh in the

Lebanon¹ was united with the seminary of Jerusalem. The

¹ Until then there had been at Sharfeh a preparatory and a senior Seminary, both under the direction of the Syrian secular clergy (TRANSLATOR).

senior seminary was transferred to Sharfeh, the preparatory remaining at Jerusalem. Both are now under the direction of the Benedictines.

The number of the faithful in Palestine is about, in Jerusalem, 400 souls, in Bethlehem, 100; in different parts, about 100. These are for the most part converts from schism; their social condition is very humble; and it is among them that labourers are recruited. Being of recent establishment, the Catholic Syrian church in Palestine has no fixed resources, except a subvention from the French government, and no charitable foundation. She receives little from her faithful on account of their poverty, and this penury paralyses the action of the clergy.

STEPHEN RAHHAL,
(*Syro-Benedictine priest-monk*).

THE PLIGHT OF THE LEBANON

IN the midst of universal dislocations, the troubles of the tiny Lebanon do not bulk very large. And yet they merit our attention, for the western world has a very real stake in what goes on in this particular corner of what is indiscriminately called the Arab world. Alone among the Arab countries—indeed, alone in Asia—the Lebanon has until now been a predominantly Christian country, sheltering the last vestiges of ancient Graeco-Byzantine Christendom. Because of its essentially Christian character, the Lebanon has long occupied a unique position in an area still dominated by the theocratic and intolerant tenets of Islam, especially has it become the traditional refuge for persecuted minorities of all sorts and for ideas at variance with those of Koranic teachings. In addition, the Christian Lebanon, a nation of tradesmen and land-owning peasants—rather than of feudal tenure and exploited *fellaheen*—is by analogy, inclination and tradition attached to the West. To-day, the Lebanon represents not only the ultimate safety zone left to the Oriental Christians but an essential condition for the general health of the Middle East.

At a moment when the very existence of the Lebanon is menaced at once by dissident Moslem elements within and

by hostile intentions without, it becomes necessary first to re-define and then to protect the special destiny of the country. And, indeed, there is some confusion in the minds of many, both here and elsewhere, as to exactly what justifies the separatism of this former Syrian *vilayet*. Only a few days ago, a Moslem member of the Lebanese Chamber of Deputies, a certain Ibrahim Haidar, stated in the Beirut newspaper *Al-Hayet* that he, for one, looked upon the President of Syria, Mr. Shukri Kouatly, as his chief, adding that he could not recognize the erection by foreigners of former Turkish administrative districts into separate states. Mr. Haidar's remarks reflect an attitude widespread among his co-religionists in the Middle East, many of whom consider the Lebanon to be a wholly artificial state invented by the French in 1920 to please their Christian clientele.

It is in the interests of everyone concerned that this theory be emphatically refuted. The Lebanon (as distinct perhaps from the "Greater Lebanon,") far from being a French invention, is, on the contrary, a more valid political, cultural, religious and even ethnical unit than is Syria itself. The national history of modern Syria, an uneasy amalgam of many different races and religions, began barely twenty-five years ago, whereas the Lebanon was a self-conscious and recognized entity even before its great sixteenth century emir, Fakhraddin, gave it its modern physiognomy.

Although the ultra-pure Lebanese Christians, who claim the Phoenicians as their forefathers, are undoubtedly indulging in a mild form of romanticism, their country is none the less the product of a synthesis that plunges its roots deep into the Greek, Roman and Byzantine past of the eastern Mediterranean, synthesis to which the Arab invasion in the seventh century only added a new element. The late Maronite patriarch, Monsignor Hoyek, made this clear in a memorandum submitted to the Peace Conference in 1919:

"By an improper interpretation of the notion of language, some people have wished to confound Syria and the Lebanon. This is an error. Without going back to their Phoenician ancestors, the Lebanese have always constituted a national entity, distinct from neighbouring groups in language, habits, affinities, and culture. And if, only after 400 years of Arab occupation in Syria, the language of the conqueror finally, in years past, infiltrated into the Lebanon, numerous Lebanese localities, kept, and still keep, a particular accent and idiom, which alone is enough to deprive the Arabic language of

all validity as a criterion of nationality. . . . Whoever has studied the history of this country knows beyond a doubt . . . that the Lebanon maintained, in the midst of the total subjugation of the neighbouring populations by the Arabic or Turkish conqueror, often complete independence, always autonomy, which the Organic Settlement, elaborated by the Great Powers after 1860, although limiting it, only confirmed."

No one can deny, of course, the extraordinary part played by Lebanese, both here and elsewhere, in the renaissance of Arabic letters; but that, I believe, is because, rather than in spite, of the Lebanon's uninterrupted contact with the West. It often happens, moreover, that the pupil surpasses the master.

In any case, the fact that Lebanese history represents the continuity of primitive Christianity in a region where the prevailing cultural, religious and social patterns spring from the depths of Arabia is of great significance. It means that here, and here alone, have western notions of tolerance, personal liberty and civic equality become more or less acclimatized.

But the modern Lebanon has more than just historical and moral justification, for it represents a solution—an imperfect one, but a solution none the less—to the eternal problem of minority protection in the Middle East. In remoter times, Mount Lebanon provided shelter to persecuted minorities simply by its inaccessibility; but, early in the nineteenth century, upheavals throughout the Ottoman empire destroyed the country's ancient social and economic structure. For over two hundred years, the remarkable emirs of the Chehab dynasty, founded by Fakhraddin, had ruled the Lebanon from their mountain capital of Deir-el-Kamar. They had based their internal policy on an uncompromisingly enforced entente between the industrious Christian peasants and the turbulent Druze warriors, while standing off the Turks with a mixture of ruse and violence. But Mehemet Ali's invasion of Syria in 1831, led by Ibrahim Pasha and Soliman Pasha (Colonel Sèves), involved the Lebanon in an international conflict, for the Lebanese emir was the Egyptians' principal ally in Syria. In 1840, when Beirut was bombarded from the sea by an Anglo-Turkish fleet under British command, Ibrahim was forced to withdraw into Egypt and the Lebanese emir to flee. Thereafter, anarchy spread through the mountain, and the whole fabric of Lebanese life was badly rent. The Turks took over, and abetted by every possible means

the animosities dividing Christians and Druzes. France protested this policy in 1845 but to no avail. In 1860 the Turkish policy of malicious provocation paid off with terrible increment. The Druze tribesmen swooped down upon the Maronites and massacred 6,000 of them in two days.

The fever spread to Damascus, where the Moslems bathed that city in Christian blood. Only weariness brought the killings to an end on the third day after 3,000 Christians had perished. A famous Moslem tract circulated at that time said in part: "We recall to you the words of the Most High: 'Make no differentiation between the infidel nations, for we have thrown enmity and discord into their midst until the day of judgment.' Moslem nation, awake! Awake to destroy the race of the servants of the cross, in this country which they have defiled." Although certainly the sincere Arab nationalists of to-day nourish no such dire intentions—some, indeed, would revive the enlightenment and tolerance of the first Caliphate—recent events in Cairo, Alexandria, Aleppo and Tripoli come as evil echoes of those of 1860, and it would be folly to ignore the danger that Moslem fanaticism presents to the Christian minorities in the Levant.

Europe did not allow the Lebanon to die in 1860. At a meeting of the powers in Paris on 3rd August, it was agreed that a French expeditionary force should be dispatched at once to the Levant to help the Sultan restore order. After long negotiations, the powers ratified, in 1864, a so-called Organic Settlement giving the Lebanon, stripped, however, of the non-Christian areas conquered by the emirs, an internationally guaranteed status under a Christian governor and within the framework of the Ottoman empire. The precedent was an important one, for Europe had intervened to save the Lebanon as a Christian home in the Moslem world. After the collapse of the Ottoman empire in 1918, the League of Nations, faithful to this tradition, undertook to protect the Oriental minorities coming under the system of the mandates. Again the Lebanon reappeared as the principal element in the system of minority protection; recognized by the community of nations, the Lebanon was set on the road to independence by France, the mandatory power.

By forming this predominantly Christian republic, France acted in accordance with a tradition that was not only French but European. Unfortunately, however, they were unable to revive the Lebanon of Fakhraddin and of the emirs.

The coastal plain, with its overwhelming Moslem majority, and the Bekaa Valley on the inland side of Mount Lebanon, also largely Moslem, were appended to the Christian mountain in order to form a fairly sound economic entity called the "Greater Lebanon." But the mountain no longer dominated the plain as in former times, and the old capital of the emirs, Deir-el-Kamar, had become only a sleepy little village in the hills. The French soon found that the Moslems resented being lumped with the Christians, and that the Christians, while wanting their country as big as possible, often refused to look upon the Moslem as real Lebanese. Thus the Lebanon was divided from the start into two hostile camps—the "felt hats" and the "tarbooshes"—which glared at each other over an impassable abyss. This has constantly made for friction, prevented the formation of a homogeneous Lebanese nationality and weakened the country politically and morally to the point where its special identity has been seriously jeopardized.

But as long as the mandatory power remained in the country, the Lebanon within in present frontiers was assured at least of its existence. That authority has now, for reasons that do not lie within the scope of the present article, been abolished. For France, the change is but of minor importance; indeed, the administration of the mandate, often bungled, was always a costly and quite unremunerative affair. But for the Lebanon, the "independence" acquired, not as the result of unity, common effort and sacrifice, but purely as the result of the dynamics of international power politics, is a highly dangerous innovation. For the first time since 1864, the Lebanon, deprived of an international guarantee, will have to depend exclusively on its own resources in its struggle to survive.

The country has a population of barely over a million. The Moslem element, especially the Chiites, far more prolific than the Christians, already constitute a majority, according to reliable estimates. The Christians, numbering about 350,000 Maronites with smaller numbers of Greek Orthodox, Melkites, Syriacs, Chaldeans, Armenians, etc., still probably represent the greater force in terms of wealth and intelligence, particularly if one takes into account the emigration, several hundred thousand strong, scattered throughout the western world and parts of Africa. But the rising tide of pan-Arab nationalism, with its baggage of Mohammedan fanaticism, is a powerful stimulus for the Lebanese Moslems and Druzes,

whose arrogance and aggressiveness have greatly increased in recent months. And there can be little doubt that the Arab countries generally, in spite of professions of eternal affection, are fundamentally hostile to the Lebanon, for the Lebanon represents a centre of non-conformity and disaffection in their midst. The friendly overtures made to the Lebanon by the Arab League were designed to exploit the differences between the Beirut government and the French with a view to bringing the Lebanon more solidly into the pan-Arab orbit. This goal having been reached, some Arab leaders feel that the time is at hand for the Lebanon to disappear as an independent state; it is just too absurdly small, they say.

Meanwhile, in the Lebanon itself, a marked resurgence of confessional animosity seems to be heading the country toward civil war. Last December, a Moslem bloc was revived and endowed with a new and more militant executive committee. And now the Moslems have succeeded in drawing a number of Druzes into a so-called Higher Mohammedan Council. This organism is unfortunately looked upon as being of British inspiration, for it was formed during a recent visit to Beirut of the Mufti of Damascus, who is said to have discussed the matter with Colonel Noureddin Marsack, British Press Attaché in Damascus and a convert to Islam.

In the face of these manœuvres on the part of elements hostile to the Lebanon, a number of Christians recently formed a party of their own, known as the Christian Socialist Party. Until now, however, the government has refused to authorize the new group, which may be condemned to lead a clandestine existence, or none at all.

The Lebanese Christians realize that their efforts to maintain the Lebanon in its present form are almost sure to fail unless some sort of international guarantee can be obtained for the country. For if the Moslems gain a majority in the Chamber of Deputies—as they are sure to do sooner or later—what is to prevent that body from voting the Lebanon out of existence in the interests of Syrian unity? Moreover, the efforts of a number of Arabs in Syria, Transjordan and Iraq to bring to fruition emir Abdallah's plan for a Hashimite kingdom of Greater Syria constitute a direct menace to the Lebanon. This plan, which would partly realize a dream long caressed by British officials of the Lawrence school—the dream of great Arab union, resuscitating the glories of the Caliphate linked to Britain by bonds of gratitude and amity—has oper-

backing in numerous British circles. Deprived of outside protection, the Lebanon has become very vulnerable ; the concerted action of emir Abdallah's partisans in Syria and in the Lebanon itself is already causing concern here, concern that is not lessened by talk of common Arab citizenship and of a joint Arab military staff. In addition, the present chaotic situation in Syria has greatly strengthened the royalist party in that country and depressed the republicans. Emir Abdallah and his cohorts stand to gain.

But "independence" means that, from the legalistic point of view, outside intervention on behalf of the Christian minorities is no longer possible, not at least until actual massacres occur. Meanwhile, the problem of minority protection, so intimately bound up with the larger problem of civil liberty itself, lies within the competence only of the local government. Unfortunately, however, the incumbent regime, born in 1943 under conditions of war and foreign occupation, is neither capable, nor desirous, of imposing a solution. Civil liberty is fast disappearing in a regime of *décrets-lois*. And yet the Lebanon has once again become the refuge for persecuted minorities, this time for Syrian Christians fleeing the resurgence of Moslem fanaticism in Syria. Several thousand have already trickled into the Lebanon, and more will come as existence grows more precarious in their own country. But even here they are not without some anxiety for the future.

The prestige of the foreign legations here, particularly those of Great Britain and the United States, is decisive. Only a real determination on the part of the great powers to save the Lebanon can have any effect. It is to be deplored that, at present, the local representatives of Great Britain and of the United States give every evidence of hostility toward the Christian Lebanon, whose vital interests they systematically neglect. Anglo-American policy in the area has one constant : Arab appeasement. But must the Lebanon be sacrificed on the altar of Arab friendship ? To be sure, the Lebanon is a handsome present to offer the Arabs. But by so doing, we step on our real friends to please our dubious ones. In the end, this policy is bound to boomerang, for the Lebanese Christians are likely to die hard. When they realize that the French have been definitely eliminated and that they have been utterly abandoned by Great Britain and the United States, they will seek protection elsewhere. They have not forgotten, nor do the Russian agents here

let them forget, that once Russia was the great protectress of the Orthodox community. It is clear that the departure of the French has left a vacuum which others will try to fill. That vacuum should not have been allowed to exist. None the less, in the present circumstances, Russia, although glad to be able to speak in the name of a minority group, is not inclined to save the Lebanon. The Lebanon in its present form can only survive if Great Britain and the United States prove effectively that they are well disposed towards it.

MICHAEL CLARK.

Beirut (Lebanon),

26th April, 1946.

THE LITURGICAL PUBLICATIONS OF THE SACRED EASTERN CONGREGATION

Editor's note.—The first part of this article was published in the July—September issue, 1945.

SECOND PART

THE same service of co-ordinating and restoring the primitive rite is being rendered to the Church in Ethiopia. Here the Alexandrine rite of the Copts of Egypt is followed, whilst there are also numerous borrowings from the ancient Syrian rites together with compositions of native origin. But printing has been only recently introduced into Ethiopia; texts and manuscripts are scattered in various parts and show a wide divergence of readings. The Portuguese missionaries of the sixteenth century had had, moreover, the same unhappy idea that they had conceived with regard to India, namely of making a clean sweep of the national rite and of substituting for it the Roman rite: the most they did was to translate it into Ghe'ez, the ancient language of Ethiopia, which has been preserved as the liturgical and literary tongue. All that they gained by this was their forcible expulsion from the country, and they also rendered any Catholic apostolate impossible there until towards the middle of the nineteenth century. Unfortunately their prejudices against the Eastern rite were shared only too often by their successors, who finished by persuading the congregation *de Propaganda Fide* that in reality the Ethiopian-Alexandrine rite does not exist but is merely a confused mass of heretical or apocryphal texts or of

superstitious practices: the best course to follow, in their view, was to tolerate it provisionally for the eucharistic sacrifice and, for the rest, to make use of translations from Latin into Ghe'ez. It is thus that the Propaganda Congregation, whilst encouraging the revision of the Ethiopian Missal (of which there have been two Catholic editions, in 1890 and in 1913)¹ published in 1910 a little Ritual of the Sacraments in Ghe'ez which is nothing more than a literal translation of the Roman *Rituale*. The progress that has been made in Ethiopian studies has given the lie to the legend of the non-existence of the Ethiopian-Alexandrine rite, and the publication in 1935 of the catalogue of the Ethiopian manuscripts of the Vatican—due in large measure to the present secretary of the Eastern Congregation—has thrown into relief all the wealth of material that could be tapped from a source peculiarly rich in liturgical texts.

It was necessary to work with the utmost speed in view of the fact that the second Catholic edition of the Missal² was practically out of print. In 1937 a special sub-commission was formed in order to revise the seventeen Ethiopian anaphora, i.e., the seventeen versions of the canon. The two editions published by the dissidents were taken into account, in order to depart as little as possible from their version: nevertheless, apart from several expressions which are evidently monophysite, certain puerilities had crept in—legends due to the considerable influence on all the literary production of Ethiopia of the Christian apocryphal literature that flourished in the early centuries. Whilst this work was in progress, a speedy publication was achieved of the *Ordo communis* or ordinary of the eucharistic liturgy up to the anaphora (or canon) and of the so-called "anaphora of the Apostles," which is the most frequently in use, in order to provide the young priests trained at the Ethiopian College in Rome with a text correct both as regards ritual and dogma. In 1944, all the work being finished, a *de luxe* edition enriched with page headings and illuminations drawn from good manuscripts—a feature appearing for the first time—was undertaken by the Vatican press and will be completed in a few months' time.

The revision of the Ritual has been put off until a later date: for a work of this kind needs to be long and painstaking, and often requires intensive research to a degree that only those

¹ There are two further editions brought out by the dissidents in 1926.

² Not in reality a true Missal, but simply the "Book of the Offering."

who have had some experience in these matters can realize. Also in need of revision was the Pontifical: until these last few years, the dissident Ethiopian Church had never had more than a single bishop, always a Copt, who had been obtained from the patriarch of Alexandria of the same nation; not knowing Ghe'ez, he would confer orders in the Coptic-Arabic of his Pontifical. Shortly before the outbreak of war between Italy and Abyssinia, King Haile Sellassie had finally obtained five bishops from the Coptic patriarch, and the ritual of ordinations had been translated into Ghe'ez. Among the Catholics, orders were being conferred in Latin after the model of the Roman Pontifical. Certain officials would have liked to see this usage continued and extended to all Pontifical functions through the introduction of an abridged Roman Pontifical translated into Ghe'ez of which they had had printed a few copies only. The Eastern Congregation managed to procure the manuscript text of the Ghe'ez version of the ordination rite, made a careful revision of it, and published a beautiful provisional edition which was used for the first time in 1939.

A further task on hand was that of the Divine Office: the horology—merely to mention the essential part, which corresponds substantially to that of the Byzantines—existed in four different recensions. The most generally used had been known until then only through a Russian version: the commission compared it with the other recensions and with parallel texts in Coptic, Greek and Syriac, as well as with a Slav translation, and in 1940 the printing of a practically definitive edition was accomplished. The publication of the Ethiopian text is to appear as soon as the Missal is finished. Until this time, the Catholics had hardly anything other than the psalter at their disposition.

A work of no less importance, more on account of the consequences it may have, was undertaken on the express order of Pius XI in 1934 and is now being pursued by another sub-commission.

When the first groups of Russian Catholics began to be formed in 1918, they found themselves in great difficulty not only for lack of priests but also with regard to liturgical books. Until then Russia had been the great source of supply for all the Slav countries who do not follow the rite, peculiar to itself in some respects, of the Ruthenians. Now she had become a sealed country, and the production of religious

books was forbidden.¹ The liturgical books of the Ruthenians could not be used, partly because of their numerous variants, and partly because of the hybridisms which had gradually crept in, in spite of the fact that the Holy See had never given its approval of them.² As time went on, and even though the synod at Lvov in 1891 had begun a reaction against this tendency, these alterations and modifications had multiplied to such an extent that the use of the Ruthenian books, for those who follow a pure rite, was becoming practically impossible. In 1923-24, the mission sent by Pius XI to the Balkans, to the Near East, and as far as Poland, had indeed bought as many liturgical books as they had been able to procure; and by indirect means they had even been able to obtain a certain number from Russia itself: but it was only a palliative. In the motu proprio *Quam Sollicita* of December 21st, 1934, Pius XI ordered the preparation of a complete edition of all the books in question, duly revised and corrected wherever necessary. It was the first time that the Holy See had turned its attention to liturgical texts of the Byzantine rite in Church Slavonic.

At the same time the reaction against hybridism and alterations, which had never completely ceased among the Ruthenians, was making itself more widely felt. The first plenary conference of the Ruthenian episcopate, held at Lvov in November 1927, requested the Holy See to undertake the preparation of a typical edition, after the manner of those of the Latin church, and set up a first commission to prepare the work. This soon showed itself to be insufficient, and a second, composed of a greater number of persons, was substituted for it and all the proceedings were sent to Rome.

The purification of the Ruthenian rite having been decided in principle, the hope was once more entertained of being able to compile a single edition. This scheme had to be abandoned. Since the invention of printing and as a consequence of the virtual monopoly that Venice possessed for the publication of liturgical books in Greek, many variants had been suppressed, and there had gradually been formed a sort of Greek vulgate which represents the text still in use.

¹ The printing of Orthodox service books is now allowed in the U.S.S.R.
—EDITOR.

² Apart from four points which, at that time, were not considered to have much bearing on the purity of the rite, but which today, in view of the progress made in Eastern studies and the better understanding of the Eastern question, can no longer remain thus modified.

In the seventeenth century Nikon, patriarch of Moscow from 1652 to 1667, a man very struck on all things Greek, proceeded to a revision of the Slavonic texts based on the Venetian editions. This revision greatly helped to create a schism in the Russian Church, which still persists: the *Staroobriadtsy* or Old Ritualists, called also the *Staroveroy* or Old Believers, refused to accept the new books. Nevertheless, Nikon's reform triumphed, and today his text represents the reading followed by the old imperial Russian Church (now become the patriarchal Church of Moscow), by the Serbs and even by the Bulgars, although the latter have been showing for several years a marked tendency to approximate to the innovations introduced by the patriarchate of Constantinople. As soon as specific work on the Russian question was envisaged, it became imperative to depart as little as possible from the books at present in use in Russia and in the churches of the emigration.

Now in the seventeenth century, the metropolitan province of Kiev was under the dominion of Poland. One of Nikon's predecessors, Peter Moghila (1633-46), a man of considerable learning, had embarked upon an analogous revision, but with this difference—he had better conserved the ancient Slav tradition, a tradition which sometimes represents a reading more conformable to the old Greek manuscript texts and even to the first printed editions. Moghila's recension is therefore often coincident with the books of the Russian *Staroveroy*: that of Nikon was accepted at Kiev only from the time when that town and its territory were reunited to Russia, while Moghila's recension is that which the Ruthenian Catholics still follow today, disregarding the hybridisms and arbitrary innovations. It is not part of the tradition of the Roman Church to deprive particular churches of their own liturgy, when the latter has antiquity to uphold it; already St. Pius V, the great reformer of the Roman rite in accordance with the mandate issued by the oecumenical Council of Trent, had made an exception for all the liturgies which could lay claim to a history of two hundred years. The old religious orders of the West—the Benedictines,¹ Carthusians, Dominicans, Bare-footed Carmelites have still their own more or less special rites; the church of Lyons has retained many features of the old Roman rite, the province of Milan has still its very old "Ambrosian" rite, whilst quite recently Pius XI gave his approval to a new edition of the Breviary and Missal.

¹ Benedictines have their own Breviary but use the Roman Missal. Cistercians have their own rite at Mass as well as their own Breviary.

proper to Braga in Portugal. Besides this, the Vatican basilica still retains in its psalter and hymnary a reading which is not the revised one of Urban VIII. To come back to the Byzantine rite, the monastery of Grottaferrata and its dependencies still keep jealously to the old Italo-Byzantine rite of the tenth to eleventh centuries ; and there was no reason for depriving the Ruthenians of their legitimate traditions on the pretext of a unification which moreover does not form part of the Eastern heritage.

All these considerations, which gradually came to the fore, retarded the execution of the measure prescribed by Pius XI in 1934. The idea of a single edition being now abandoned, the line to take was very simple. For the so-called vulgate Russian recension, the text and the rubrics of the books in current use in Russia should be reproduced, merely with the elimination of anything not conformable to Catholic doctrine. For the Ruthenian recension, even the verbal variants should be accepted, when they had in their favour a really constant tradition. Such, in a very few words, were the conclusions reached on 10th February 1938, by the plenary congregation of the cardinals of the Eastern Congregation. Two parallel commissions were nominated : one was to be concerned with the vulgate edition, the other with the Ruthenian, taking into account the results of the investigations made by the Lvov commission. In point of fact, the two commissions were composed of the same people, simply changing the personnel to represent more particularly one or other of the recensions. They had also the faculty of bringing in for the scriptural texts a specialist in biblical studies, who was in fact a Ruthenian. For the purely philological and grammatical questions, there would be the help of one of the best experts in Church Slavonic language and literature, who by happy chance was at that time established in Rome. The printing would be done at the monastery of Grottaferrata, and the two editions would come out concurrently, the typographical composition of the one being utilized for the other.

It was decided to begin on the most essential of the books—the *Služebnik* or “Book of the (Divine) Service” which contains the priest’s and the deacon’s part of Evensong, Matins and the hours, as well as the three traditional eucharistic liturgies of St. John Chrysostom, St. Basil and of the Pre-anctified Gifts, plus the calendar and divers supplements. The work of the two commissions began on 15th March

1938; they were often presided over by Cardinal Eugène Tisserant, secretary of the Sacred Eastern Congregation—the prefect of the congregation being the Sovereign Pontiff himself—and they have continued without interruption from that day to this. An idea of the minute care of their investigations can be seen when it is realized that sixty-two sessions have been devoted to the Ruthenian recension and thirty-one to the editing of the "vulgate."

From the point of view of dogma no serious corrections of the latter has had to be done. Apart from a very few passages, the entire liturgy of the Russian Church, as has already been said, is Catholic, with the exception, naturally of a certain number of commemorations of persons whose sanctity the Catholic Church does not recognize. Obviously the name of the Sovereign Pontiff has been introduced wherever, according to the Slav custom, mention is made of the supreme head of the hierarchy, and all trace of Cæsaropapism has been removed by the commemoration of the civil power—with a double formula, one for monarchical and the other for republican states—after the commemoration of the religious authority. Several of the rubrics have been slightly modified and improved: for Evensong and Matins a greater number of sub-divisions corresponding to the different periods of the liturgical year have been introduced and the rites of the liturgy of the Presanctified, which before this were to be found scattered in three different places, have been for the first time brought together. Unlike the procedure of earlier Roman commissions, it was resolved that this edition should show a real progress in the disposition and clarity of the texts. The great innovation consists in the fact that for the first time a certain number of Russian saints have received right of mention—about thirty of them, carefully chosen, and all going back to a time when the separation of Russia from the Catholic Church cannot be considered as completely consummated. This choice, based upon impartial judgment, does not exclude the possibility of still other saints being admitted when more progress has been made in the study of Slav hagiography. This has no connection, whether direct or indirect, with the canonization of saints. When a dissident Eastern church comes into the Catholic Church she brings into it all her rites and all her liturgy; so also her menology or liturgical calendar. Only what is directly or indirectly against faith is excluded—but this does not prevent the need for there being well-chosen critical standards for the

moral, historical and hagiographical aspects, so that the inclusion or exclusion of certain saints in a Catholic calendar can be decided upon, and so that the position of others can be submitted to fresh examination in accordance with developments in hagiographical studies.

As is just, the recent Beatified of the Eastern Church have been inserted in the calendar in their respective places: Gomitas Keumurgean, an Armenian (5th June), Francis, Muti and Raphael Masabki, Maronites (10th July); Gabra Michael, an Ethiopian (28th August). The Slavs have a certain number of Western saints: St. Ireneus, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, and even, as a result of the old caravan routes coming from the banks of the Rhine, St. Martin of Tours and St. Julian of Le Mans. A single name has been added to these; that of St. Francis of Assisi, in view of the fact that there exists in Russian a large amount of literature devoted to him by the dissidents themselves, who have always perceived a great resemblance between Franciscan humility and gentleness and the similar characteristics of saintly Russians. Also the acceptance of St. Francis in Russia acted as a spur to the Capuchins of the Eastern rite, who were working with such success in the eastern provinces of Poland at the time of the outbreak of the war. It goes without saying that St. Josaphat Kuncevich, the illustrious martyr of the Ruthenian union (1623), will be honoured henceforth on 12th November by the Russian Catholics as well as by the Ruthenians.

The two *Sluzebniki*, printed in red and black with decorated letters on beautiful tinted Slovakian paper, appeared in 1940 at the same time as a separate edition of the St. John Chrysostom Liturgy in octavo and with larger type. The following year brought four separate printings of different parts of the complete *Sluzebnik*, for the greater convenience of celebrants. At the same time work was started upon a splendid edition of the *Naprestolnoe*, gospel book "of the altar," in order to distinguish it from the gospels of smaller size. This edition is in quarto, and has special ornaments, page-endings, initial letters and capitals designed for the purpose. It consists of a double recension: the text, carefully revised with regard to the Slav version, is the same but for a single word which in Ruthenian has a displeasing meaning; but the calendar, which is traditionally added to this book, is naturally a little different.

So as to give as much help as possible to military chaplains and travelling priests and missionaries who will have to take over after the war the care of numerous vacant parishes, the commission brought out in 1943, in a separate small octavo volume, of equally fine finish, the gospel texts for Sundays and all the more important feasts, as well as those for the common of the saints. After this, work was at once started on a similar compilation containing the epistles for the same days with all the supplementary texts for the celebration of the Divine Liturgy. The extension of the war to the confines of Rome did not retard the going to press: all the material was transported in time to the Vatican press which gave refuge for several months to the printers of Grottaferrata. The press at the monastery escaped as by a miracle: a bomb fell right in the centre of the printing works, but did not explode and was able to be removed in time. The volume was finished in April 1945, still in a double edition. Intended for the reader or server, it contains moreover all the common responses of the liturgy, these being much developed in the Byzantine rite as in all the rites of the East.

Whilst the epistles and gospels for Sundays and feast days were printing, work was started on the revision of the *Trebnik* (or Ritual) of the "vulgate" recension, that of the Ruthenians being held back for a later date on account of its very considerable variants, which demand special study. From the end of the eighteenth century it had been noticed that the *Trebnik* used in Russia was practically a literal translation of the Greek *euchologion*, "Benedict XIV's," printed at Rome in 1754 after a careful revision of its doctrinal content. The explanation of this is simple: the *Trebnik* of Nikon, the Moscow patriarch (1658), after which all the subsequent Moscow editions have been modelled, and the 1727 Greek edition of Venice, upon which Benedict XIV based his revision, are derived equally from a common archetype—the Greek *euchologion* of Giovanni Pietro Pinelli, published at Venice in 1638. The Ruthenian translation, on the other hand, represents an earlier Slav version, and in his revision of 1646 the metropolitan of Kiev, Peter Moghila, did not take into account the Greek editions of Venice. Once this close relationship had been duly noted, the commission's task became very much easier: all that remained to be done was work upon one or two Slav texts whose equivalent can no longer be found in modern Greek, or perhaps has never existed; and above all to improve layout and editing of

the contents—a thing which nobody had thought of doing in the eighteenth century, and the absence of which has caused the Greek *euchologion*, at least as it appears in the Slav *Trebnik*, to be one of the most disordered and unwieldy liturgical books in existence.

It can be said that in this respect the work of the commission has made considerable progress. The few rare errors or inconsistencies in the Slav version have been corrected, and the whole matter of the *Trebnik*, apart from the pontifical and the purely monastic sections, which have been reserved for a special book, has been divided into three small volumes, which could be bound in one if desired. The first volume, which has appeared at the time of writing (July 1945), contains the rites of the sacraments and short occasional offices, beginning with the prayer over the mother on the day of the birth of a child up to the commanding of the departing soul. Whilst still retaining in their entirety, and in a better-edited form, the rites (now generally accepted as too long) of confession and the last anointing (called the rite of the Holy Oil; administered by seven priests), for the sake of those who still desire to use them, there has also been inserted an abridged rite of Penance, extracted from the longer rite. It is the first time this has appeared, and it will put an end to the more or less successful private attempts, that have drawn too closely upon the Roman ritual. A second abridged rite is the sacrament of the Holy Oil: this had already been approved by the Propaganda Congregation in 1916 for the Rumanians of Transylvania under the pressure of circumstances, but it has been slightly revised according to a more strictly liturgical and traditional criterion. Adapted formulas have been provided for the administration of Baptism, of Confirmation (of which the *customary* minister—this is not *ordinary* in the theological sense—is in oriental rites the priest), of Penance, and of the Holy Oil in case of imminent death. The volume finishes with an occasional office that is very popular among the Slavs: the *moleben*. This is modelled on Matins and is the exact counterpart of the office called *Paraklisis* of the Mother of God that has an equal popularity among the Greeks and is used on all sorts of occasions. There has also been added as an appendix a ceremonial, based on the Liturgy of the Presanctified, for the giving of holy communion outside of the eucharistic liturgy. This has been done to put a brake on private fancies, cases of which have been multiplying of recent years, though it is not much in harmony with the

true spirit of either the Western or Eastern church. The second volume will contain all the funeral rites and the third all the remaining sections of a very complete *Trebnik*. Afterwards will appear the books containing the divine office in the strict interpretation of the term.

These books have had a great success : all priests who have been able to get hold of them have done so. In view of the impossibility during the war of communication with Italy, the Ruthenian archbishop of Lvov and metropolitan of Halich, the reverend Andrew Szeptyckyj (a great promoter of liturgical reform) who died on 1st November 1944, had made a photostatic reproduction to the number of five thousand copies, of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in order to distribute them to all the clergy in the eparchies of Galicia. These improvements, still regarded a little unfavourably by certain Galicians, have been received with satisfaction by the Ruthenians of Podcarpathia and of the American colonies, as well as by the Yugoslav eparchy of Krizevci. In order to help forward the movement the commission brought out in 1944 an *Ordo celebrationis Vesperarum, Matutini et Divinae Liturgiae juxta recensionem Ruthenorum*, written in Latin so that it may reach a greater number of readers. It is a veritable little *Ceremoniale* which has brought together, completed and perfected the work taken up by the Synod of Lvov in 1891.

The difficulties referred to above are to be explained by the fact that here and there the Ruthenians show themselves to be attached more than is necessary to local customs that often are merely borrowings of Latin usages. By acting in this way they imagine they are preserving better the integrity of their Catholic faith in the presence of dissidents of the same ethnical origin as themselves, as if, in the oriental rites, latinism should act as the test of Catholicism. On the contrary, they are only putting the Holy See in contradiction with itself, seeing that for several centuries Rome has been claiming that the Eastern rites should be kept in their most authentic expression and has on several occasions taken the necessary measures to that end.

The non-Catholic Russians, who also are suffering from the lack of liturgical books, have for their part given an excellent reception to the commission's editions, and have acquired a good many copies of them. The text is the same as their own native production and the order better, a fact which they have not failed to appreciate.

These different editions, which entail considerable work and still more considerable expense, are the palpable proof of the will of the Holy See—now so many times expressed—to conserve the Eastern rites in all their purity, and not merely to tolerate them. It may sometimes have seemed in the past that this promise, however loyally made, was destined to remain unfulfilled. The fault must be imputed to the inexperience, far more than to the ill-will, of those who were charged with the fulfilment of the task. Never until this time has the Holy See concerned herself with the Slavonic books, although the Eastern church is today in fact chiefly a Slavonic church; and the non-Catholic Russians could not understand how in a religious society so strongly controlled there could exist a rite so altered as that represented by the monstrous Ruthenian Missals (which are conceived on the plan of the Roman Missal and even reproduce many of its ceremonies) unless Rome had given her secret approbation and perhaps even her encouragement. The proof of the falsity of this belief has now been made; and in order to obtain the true text of the prayers and ceremonies of the Eastern church it was often necessary to have recourse to editions of the dissidents. The movement has been launched, and it will go on until its work has been completed. For that, time, men and resources will be needed. The Catholic Church is not short of time. Providence will supply the necessary men as she has supplied them so far; and material resources are what is lacking least in the world today.

CYRIL KOROLEVSKIJ.

REVIEW OF REVIEWS

CATHOLIC REVIEWS

Irenikon : Tome XVIII, 1945 and Tome XIX, 1946. These will be reviewed later.

Unitas : No. I, March 1946 (via Matteo Boiardo, 16. Rome). This is the first issue of the official organ of the new Roman International Association, *Unitas*. The aims of this review are described in a letter from the President of the Association, Rev. Fr. Charles Boyer, S.J., as working for the spiritual and ecclesiastical unity of the world in the spirit of Catholicism. The first of the statutes of *Unitas* is:—To promote an association supra-national and supra-social, a spiritual unity

of the nations for the protection of the patrimony of Christian civilization. We welcome *Unitas* and will review it in our next issue.

Theological Studies : published by the Theological Faculties of the Society of Jesus in the United States, 1943-45.

It was in our July-December issue of 1943 that we first welcomed this quarterly which had just come out in 1940.

We cannot, in our limited space, give this excellent review the full attention it deserves, hence we will confine our remarks to a few of the articles that bear most closely on our work and for the rest indicate to our readers the nature of their contents.

We will begin with making honourable mention of a number of articles. A description of the Apostolic Constitution *Deus Scientiarum Dominus*, its origin and spirit is given by Father A. Bea, S.J., of the Biblical Institute. There are a number of articles throughout the issue dealing with biblical questions ; e.g.—“The Synoptic Healing Narrative and Rabbinic Analogies” by L. J. McGinley, S.J. (in the first number of 1943) and he carries on the examination into “Hellenic Analogies,” No. 3. In 1944, No. 4, we have “The Prophets and Sacrifice,” by J. E. Coleran, S.J., and two recently discovered “Papyri,” by J. J. Collins, S.J. A very interesting discussion on the “Roman Origin of the Captivity Letters” is given by Father J. T. Curran, S.J., in No. 2, 1945 and in the same issue the question of the “Lost Books of the Bible” is dealt with by A. C. Cotter, S.J.

There are, however, in the present series, a greater number of articles dealing with moral problems and with those of scientific interest, besides, of course, those which have some direct or indirect bearing on Dogma. We will mention a few of these : “The Morality of Obliteration Bombing,” by J. C. Ford, S.J. (No. 3, 1944), “The Supernatural Value of a Soldier’s Death” by D. J. Saunders, S.J. Father P. F. Palmer, S.J., in his paper “Jean Morin and the Problem of private Penance” (No. 3, 1945) states the case in favour of the opinion that private discipline had always been observed from the earliest years of the Church’s history. There is another article bearing on the same subject in No. 1, 1945 : “Absolution in the Early Church,” by C. McAufliffe, S.J. Each issue has a section devoted to “Current Theology” which is a most valuable feature of the Review ; in No. 1, 1944 it is devoted to “The Study of Scripture” and it gives a summary of the Popes’ encyclicals and directions on the

subject from Leo XIII's *Aeterni Patris* to Pius XII's *Providentissimus Deus*. In No. 2, 1944 the section on current theology deals with the "Theological Opinion of the Evolution of Man."

It is from this point that we can go into some detail as to the Review's dealing with subjects that more directly bear on our work. The thesis considered under current theology by Father J. C. Murray, S.J., in No. 2, 1943 is "Intercredal Co-operation: its Theory and its Organization." This is largely the general review of the case as it had been considered under various aspects in several articles in the current and other issues (including articles that appeared in previous years already reviewed). We will give them in the order that they are published in the numbers under discussion: by the same author, "Co-operation: Some Further Views" (*Current Theology*, No. 1, 1943); "Intercredal Co-operation in Papal Documents," by Father W. Parsons, S.J. (No. 2); and in the same issue "Intercredal Co-operation: its Theory and its Organization," by Father J. C. Murray, S.J. There is some correspondence on the same in No. 3.

Then there are other articles that go to add depth to the whole discussion: "The Problem of Persecution in the Early Church," by E. A. Ryan, S.J. (No. 3, 1944); "Freedom of Religion" discussed both as a thesis in "*Current Theology*" (No. 1, 1945) and as an article (No. 2, 1945) both by J. C. Murray, S.J. "Three Early Treatises on the Church" (No. 2, 1944), in which Father E. A. Ryan treats of the treatises of Archbishop Giacomo Capocci's *De Reginime Christiano*, John Wycliff's *De Ecclesia* and John Hus's *De Ecclesia*. Then there are two excellent articles by S. J. Grabowski of the Catholic University of America on "The Holy Ghost in the Mystical Body of Christ according to St. Augustine" in No. 4, 1944 and No. 1, 1945.

And yet to add to these we are reminded of the present day importance of two great eirenetical theologians, viz., Möhler; "The Development of Dogma," by Father G. Voss, S.J. (No. 3, 1943) and Scheeben; "The Revival of Theology," by C. Vollert, S.J. (No. 4, 1945), while Father Voss also writes on "Missionary Accommodation and Ancestral Rites in the Far East" (No. 4, 1943). These headings (and this is not an exhaustive list) alone show what valuable material may be found in *Theological Studies* for all who are reading the *Eastern Churches Quarterly* seriously and want to follow its ideals. It is reviews such as this that will help to develop a Catholic eirenic theology.

The Ark, Vol. I, No. 1-7, 1946.

This is a new monthly review of the Ukrainian Catholics in the U.S.A. It is published by the Missionary Sisters of the Mother of God, Stamford, Conn. The editorial staff include Bishop Ambrose Senyshyn, two priests and two sisters and a layman. The editors tell us that *The Ark* "will be devoted to ecclesiastical and cultural affairs particularly of the Eastern rites." We welcome this periodical; it is a simple production which should do much to help to maintain and also to explain the Ruthenian culture among and to its own people and also to American Catholics, or for that matter any English speaking Catholics. It is well illustrated. Some of these illustrations are photographs of religious functions showing the clergy in their vestments and the arrangements of the altar, etc. It is pleasing to see the photographs of the eikonastasis in use. On the other hand those showing the altar and some of the vestments indicate the need of a liturgical revival, which of course is equally true of many Latin churches too. As a study in contrasts the pictures of the interior of the decoration of St. Vladimir's church in Kiev and that of the main altar with Ciborium in St. George's Ukrainian Catholic church, New York City —will show the need of improvement in the lines of traditional art—(see March, 1946, pp. 16, 11). But on the whole this "monthly" is well produced, it gives excellent and instructive articles and should do much to help in educating Catholics in the traditions and history of the Ukrainian people.

Life of the Spirit. A Blackfriars Review, Vol. I, Nos. 1 and 2, etc. (Blackwell, Oxford. 1s. monthly).

During the war *The Life of the Spirit* came out as a thin inclosure in *Blackfriars* and in its course reached three volumes. Now it has emerged as an independent review and it is very welcome! One is justified now in considering that the English Province of the Dominicans is rivalling their French brethren in their production of periodicals; *Blackfriars* being the English equivalent of *Vie Intellectuelle* and *Life of the Spirit* of *La Vie Spirituelle*.

We hope this second fruit of Dominican apostolate will be as widely read as the older and that it will also find its way into homes of Anglican clergy and laity. This is work for Christian Unity of the first importance.

NON-CATHOLIC

Theology. July-December, 1945 and January-August, 1946.
(Editor, Rev. A. R. Vidler, and published by the S.P.C.K.)

Does *Theology* represent Anglican Theological (in the widest sense of the term) scholarship as *The Month*, *Blackfriars* and the *Clergy Review* combined represent that of the Catholics of this country? We do not know, but we think it fair to consider that *Theology* does represent the central body of theological opinion in the Church of England, hence its importance and its value. If we follow up the above comparison we are forced to say, that although it is true the three reviews combined do represent Catholic scholarship in matters theological, yet the Catholics of this country have no real theological review and to find such in English one has to go to Ireland or the U.S.A. This might be developed into a meditation. Perhaps, then, the better comparison with *Theology*, on our side, would be the U.S.A. Review, *Theological Studies*. (See above.)

Theology has reached its forty-ninth year and so has acquired a tradition and deserves to be read by our clergy and theologians. Besides articles and book reviews, an ample correspondence forms a special feature of this monthly. Here are a few of the articles that indicate the matter treated of in the contents. "The Structure of Caroline Moral Theology," by H. R. McAdoo (in November and December 1945). It is an examination of the question: "How does Anglican and Roman Catholic Moral Theology Differ?" or "Did Anglicanism Make any Reforms in Traditional Moral Theology?" It is interesting but it is hardly fair to identify the moral theology of Rome only with that of post Tridentine theologians.

"The Via Media," by R. P. McDermott: (October 1945).

This is suggested by the centenary of Newman's conversion to Rome and the problem that this event presents to Anglicans. "The Eucharistic Doctrine of Robert Isaac Wilberforce," by E. L. Mascall (June 1946), also in the same issue and continued in July two articles on "Cranmer and the Edwardine Prayer Books," by H. E. Symonds, C.R., and many others of interest.

There are, however, a number of articles of special interest in the light of a discussion being raised in the Church of England in relation to Confirmation. "The Doctrine of Confirmation," by A. M. Ramsey (September 1945),

"Baptism with water and with the Holy Ghost," by C. F. D. Moule (November 1945); "Baptism and the Outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament," by Sherwin Bailey (January 1946); "Baptism and Confirmation," by R. H. Fuller (April 1946). It will be as well if we consider this in some detail and include two other pamphlets published by the Dacre Press on the same subject. "Confirmation Today," by L. S. Thornton, C. R. (an address delivered at the Synod of St. Albans) and "The Theology of Confirmation in relation to Baptism," by Dom Gregory Dix (a lecture delivered in the University of Oxford).

In chronological order Father Thornton's address is the first voice raised in the discussion (the address was in June 1945, though not published till January 1946). Father Thornton states the whole point at issue. The question has arisen out of the Schedule, "Confirmation Today"—attached to the Interim Reports of the Joint Committees on Confirmation—as presented to the Convocations of Canterbury and York, October 1944. To use his own words the statement may be put thus: "The Report does not deal adequately with the biblical evidence, and it does not give sufficient attention to the teaching of those 'Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops' to whom the Church of England makes a special appeal.

"For example, where the Report defines the gift bestowed in Confirmation it does so in terms which correspond broadly to the later teachings of the Western Church. This is unfortunate; for it means that the characteristic doctrine of the Fathers, during the period when the Church might still be said to have a single theology, is never really considered at all. Similarly, the Western practice of separating Confirmation from Baptism is here treated, not as an innovation for which justification is required, but as a postulate or starting point from which a further drastic development may proceed, namely, a permanent postponement of Confirmation until some time after the communicant life has begun."

We will now turn to the paper of Dom Gregory Dix. The other papers which appear in *Theology* are noted by Dom Gregory in his paper. This paper itself is really based on a previous study, viz., "Confirmation or the Laying on of Hands," this was published in *Theology Occasional Papers*, No. 5 (1936). Here Dom Gregory says "I shall argue; (1) that Confirmation was in the Apostolic age regularly administered before Baptism in water; (2) that the original

matter of the rite was Baptism by effusion in oil, and that the laying on of hands in Acts was a rite with an altogether different purpose, viz., the Ordination of Prophets; (3) that Confirmation originated as the Christian equivalent of the Circumcision imposed on proselytes to Judaism and had for Christians the same importance and significance that Circumcision had for Jews, i.e., Confirmation constituted the effective rite of admission to the New Covenant." To attempt to answer this thesis would require another thesis as long or longer, and the same applies to his second pamphlet : "The Theology of Confirmation in Relation to Baptism." We will content ourselves by giving a few comments on the first thesis by a competent patristic scholar.

"The paper is based almost exclusively on patristic evidence. But patristic evidence, in order to be a cogent proof at all, must be exhaustive. A few texts, collected from a few Churches, may perhaps prove the practice of those particular Churches, but certainly not that of the whole Church.

Tradition has a power all its own, which cannot be shaken by a few isolated texts.

In the case of Confirmation *after*—not before—Baptism, c/r. *inter alia*,

Tertullian, *De Baptismo*, 6, 7, 8.

Cyprian, Ep. 73 *ad Jub*, n. 9.

St. Ambrose, *De Mysteriis*, c. 6.

Ps. Ambrose, *De Sacram*, iii, c. 2, n. 8.

St. Jerome, *Adv. Lucifer*, n. 8.

Dom Dix's paper gives the impression of over-labouring a point in order to prove a particular opinion and of forcing all evidence to agree with that prejudiced opinion."

Perhaps in some future issue of the *E.C.Q.* we will devote some articles to the study of Christian Initiation. We have stressed this discussion here in order to show the value of *Theology* in itself and as a stimulant to further output.

NEWS AND COMMENTS

PALESTINE, SYRIA AND THE LEBANON

Mr. Clark gives us a good picture of the present position in the Lebanon, and yet to get a more complete view of the situation it will be as well to consider some other opinions on the subject, opinions that are based on a consideration of the happenings in adjacent countries of Palestine, Syria and even further afield.

Mr. Clark's report is dated April 1946, and this is the date of the Report of the Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry regarding the problems of European Jewry and Palestine. *The Tablet* (11th May, 1946) had an article based on this report entitled "The Christians in Palestine," and also another article "Russia in the Middle East" (22nd June). Last year *The Church Times* (23rd November) dealt with the question in an article by Dr. S. Bolshakoff. It will be as well to begin our investigation by giving the gist of this article. The writer is viewing the position in the light of the historical attitude of the Russian Orthodox Church to Palestine and the Middle East. He first states that the Orthodox patriarchate of Antioch numbers about 250,000 Orthodox in the Lebanon and Syria. The great majority being Arabs, though there is also a considerable number of Greeks. He then gives the background to the present position both as regards the Catholic Melkites and local Orthodox under the jurisdiction of Antioch; this we will give in full.

"The patriarchate of Antioch was in a very low ebb in the eighteenth century, when almost half of its faithful and clergy became Uniate. Then the Russian Church stepped in. The Russian Mission in Jerusalem, founded in 1846, immediately began to help the Orthodox Arabs of Palestine and Syria, until then very much neglected by their own hierarchy. In 1882 the Imperial Palestinian Society was founded. In 1906 the Society possessed one hundred and one schools for the Orthodox Arabs in Syria and Palestine, with 10,430 pupils (boys and girls) and 340 native teachers. Richly endowed, the Society stopped for a time the Rome-ward tendency among the natives.

"This drifting to Uniatism was largely explicable by the fact that since the eighteenth century the Greek minority captured the hierarchy, which became mostly Hellenic, while the clergy and faithful remained Arab. The Russians soon realized that unless the patriarch of Antioch should be an Arab, many of the clergy and laity would drift to the Uniate patriarch, an Arab. In 1899 the Russians secured the election



MAR GABRIEL TAPPUNI

Syrian Patriarch of Antioch and Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church.



CHURCH OF THE NATIVITY AT BETHLEHEM



CHURCH OF THE HOLY SEPULCHRE, JERUSALEM



METROPOLITAN THEODOSIUS OF TYRE AND SIDON
giving Holy Communion to members of the Orthodox Youth
Movement in the Cathedral at Beirut, 17th March, 1946.

of an Arab, Meletios, to the patriarchate. The Greeks did not want to recognize him, but finally agreed. Nevertheless, the friction lasted for a time, until it was completely liquidated some years ago. A number of bishops of Greek race, proportionate to the Greek population, was granted to the minority.

“The Russian collapse in 1917 and the French mandate were disastrous to the Orthodox. The Orthodox schools began to disappear, while the Latin and Uniate started to grow. While the French mandate was highly popular with the Uniates, the other Christians began to consort with the Arab nationalists and demand independence. When the recent Syrian troubles broke out, the Maronite patriarch, Mgr. Arida, convened a conference of Christian leaders in his residence in Lebanon. All Uniates responded, no Orthodox nor Armenians nor Jacobites appeared on the spot.

“The conference wanted to preserve the French connexion in one way or another, and objected to the inclusion of Lebanon into an Arab bloc, afraid that it would lead to the eventual absorption of the Christian majority in the Middle East by the Moslems. The conference decided to send a Maronite bishop to the United States and Europe to ask the guarantee of the United States, Great Britain, France and Russia for the independence of Lebanon and the Christian minorities.”

This is at any rate how a Russian Orthodox sees the situation. Now there seems to be a distinction to be made between the Orthodox living in the Lebanon and those in Palestine as regards to the French protection of the Lebanon, for in spite of Dr. Bolshakoff’s statement above we are able to give a letter sent by the Orthodox metropolitan of the Lebanon to the Holy Father :

GREEK ORTHODOX METROPOLITANATE OF THE LEBANON

HADETH, near Beyrouth.

HADETH,

5th, November 1945.

To His Holiness Pope Pius XII,
VATICAN CITY.

Very Holy Father,

The Christians of the whole world have been accustomed, in every age, in every place, to look towards Rome in their times of trouble.

In our turn, Very Holy Father, although an Orthodox prelate, we come to solicit your support, to enable us to overcome the danger which threatens all the Christians of the Near East.

We desire the independence of our Lebanon, but we insist also that it shall be as it has ever been the refuge of Christianity. The majority of the Christian leaders in the Lebanon agree that France, the age-long protector of the Christians of the East, should not abandon her traditional rôle and should by this title be a guarantor of the independence of the Lebanon.

We are entrusting this letter to our dear son, Doctor Habib Joseph Awad. He will have the honour of presenting this missive to Your Holiness and of explaining to You the true position of the Christians in the Lebanon.

Trusting in the assistance which You will be willing to give to our cause, which is besides the cause of all the Christian communities of the East, we assure you, Very Holy Father, of our filial affection.

METROPOLITAN ELIAS KARAIN,
Archbishop of the Lebanon.

He certainly seems to be in agreement with the Maronite patriarch, whose appeal we have already mentioned in a previous issue (July-September 1945). The patriarch also wrote to the pope and to the president of the U.S.A.

On the other hand it is evident from the report of the Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry that not only the Orthodox but also the Catholic Melkites place themselves on the side of the Arabs. In fact the leader and spokesman of Orthodox, Syrians, Copts and the Arab Evangelical Episcopal Community, as well as of the Melkites and Maronites in Palestine, is the Melkite archbishop of Galilee. This is interesting both because it shows how the Melkites, in spite of the influence of French culture, are still at heart Arabs and it also proves the prestige of the Catholic Melkites and their friendly relations with local dissident Christians.

It is certain that the patriarch of Moscow received a welcome when he visited the Lebanon and Syria, representatives of Catholics of the Oriental rites being present with the local Orthodox. This was also the case in Cairo (*E.C.Q.* above mentioned). He was not however so received by many of the Russian Orthodox in Palestine since most of the clergy do not acknowledge his jurisdiction. It is with the two

ancient patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem and the Arab speaking Orthodox that are in communion with Mgr. Alexis. This friendliness either of the Arab Christians with the Russian Church or of the Arab League with the U.S.S.R. via her Moslem population (some twenty million Russian subjects are Moslems) does not at all mean that the Arab will turn Communist (see "Russia in the Middle East" in *The Tablet*, 22nd June, 1946).

There are two other factors that should help to strengthen the Christians among the Arabs of Greater Syria. One is the recent growth of the Orthodox Youth Movement (there is also a Youth Movement among the various Catholics of Oriental rites); within three years they number some fifteen hundred members. The aim of the movement is the deepening of their spiritual life and more frequent communion is advocated. We will give more details in a future issue. This revival also shows itself by the determination of the Orthodox to remain in Syria and become leaders and so show that an Arab nationalist is not unavoidably a Moslem. And the other is the establishment of diplomatic relations between the president of the Lebanese Republic and the Holy See. (See *The Tablet*, 20th April 1946.) This is the first Arab State to have made such a request.

THE RUSSIAN ECCLESIASTICAL MISSION IN JERUSALEM.

Since the Russian clergy of this Mission have refused to recognize the patriarch Alexis, although the Greek and local bishops have tried to persuade them to do so, they are in a very awkward position. The Government have taken the side of Moscow and as a result all the Russian churches are now closed.

EGYPT AND THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES

EGYPT, and particularly the large cities of Cairo and Alexandria, offers the student of Eastern Churches, rites and liturgical customs opportunities for observation and comparison, as between Catholics and their dissident brethren, which are unobtainable elsewhere, even in Rome itself.

Leaving aside considerations of the Latin element in the Catholic life of the country—not that it is unimportant for it amounts to rather more than half of the population which owes allegiance to the See of Peter, but because followers of the Roman rite are mainly of European origins with a certain

number—small but unfortunately growing—of latinized members of Eastern rites, there are (in alphabetical order and with the nomenclature commonly given to them in Egypt) Armenians, Chaldeans, Copts, Greeks and Syrians, all of whom have their dissident counterparts, and Maronites who are unique in being without any “opposite number.”

Twenty-five years ago Egypt was struggling for independence from British control; the Capitulations were still in force. Christians of every rite and nation were apprehensive for the future: Syrians had not forgotten the persecutions of the mid-nineteenth century, whilst the massacres of 1909 and their treatment at the hands of the Turks in the war of 1914–18 were only too fresh in the minds of Armenians and Chaldeans. Would persecution be their lot once more if the withdrawal of British protection left them entirely under Moslem rule?

As conditions prospered in Egypt in the thirty years before 1922, there had been a steady influx of Armenians, Greeks, Cypriotes and Syrians who brought with them their rites and now formed communities which, ever growing, were faced with the problems of schools, benevolent societies, church building and other activities. Should they go on with these works or would it be better to lie low and await events? It was not long before it became clear that the latter course was not only unnecessary but impossible, and in the last twenty odd years there has been a growth and expansion of every Christian community in Egypt which is noteworthy.

If available statistics are to be relied upon, pride of place must be given (among Catholics of Eastern rites) to those who are the true Sons of the Pharaohs, the Copts whose numbers have increased from 25,000 in 1922 to 63,000 in 1946: this growth has brought with it, approved and supported by the State, the opening of new Catholic Coptic schools whose pupils increase annually in numbers, whilst charitable societies—so marked a feature of all eastern religious bodies, have multiplied throughout the land. The Greek Melkite Catholics—in rite Byzantine, in origin mostly Syrian—have increased from 10,000 to 25,000 in the same period. There has been little change in the numbers of the four other Eastern Churches, Armenian, Chaldean, Maronite and Syrian, but all have added to their churches, schools and other organizations.

The mutual relationships between Catholics of different rites, and between them and dissidents, are not easy to define or analyse. Among older members of any community there is a tendency to maintain a racial—almost tribal outlook which valuable as it is in helping to preserve their liturgies and other religious observances from undesirable changes, hinders the full expression of catholicity as an active, living organization. The younger generation, often educated in an atmosphere of Western Catholicity, is apt to go too far in the opposite direction and, whilst putting into practice the precepts on Catholic Action enunciated by the Holy See, ignores the precepts of that same See which condemn the latinization of their ancient liturgies and rites. Time alone can show how the two ordinances of the popes will be carried out—they are not, cannot, be incompatible.

Eastern peoples have long memories which often astound Europeans by their treatment of century old events as though they had happened yesterday (small boys will quite solemnly assure one that the decaying bodies of Pharaoh's host are the cause of the septic condition of the sea water in the Gulf of Suez). The misunderstandings, often racial and political, from which many of the schisms and heresies of a thousand and more years ago arose, still exist and form an obstacle to the reconciliation of dissidents who, often ignorant of the doctrinal import, remember the temporal causes and cling to the fear, as old as the Crusades, that return to the Bark of Peter means latinization. They are suspicious of our motives in preserving the eastern rites and when, as too often happens, they see one church or another adopting Western devotions, their suspicion that ultimate abolition of their rites and enforcement of the Roman Mass and devotions is our object, is confirmed.

On the other hand there is an exchange of ecclesiastical courtesies to which we, in this country, are quite unaccustomed. The presence of Catholic clergy at the enthronement of an Orthodox or Coptic patriarch of Alexandria is not misunderstood by either side as a recognition to his claim to the title any more than the liturgical honours paid by an Orthodox metropolitan to a delegate apostolic at the funeral service of a Greek Melkite Catholic patriarch in his cathedral are considered as an acceptance of the Primacy of Peter in the person of the pope's direct representative. From such occurrences as these it would be wrong to assume that mass conversion is about to take place—everybody present knows

and understands that they are courtesies ; no harm is done, no *communicatio in sacris* is involved but there is a recognition of the common Fatherhood of Almighty God.

Paradoxical as it may sound, Egypt is a young country and like many children suffered from growing pains in the past twenty years but its future development is a matter of endeavour on the part of all its people, no matter what their religion or racial origin may be. So Catholics and non-Catholics of every rite are taking their share in the work that is to be done—they are no longer members of religious bodies under foreign protection (as was the case when the Capitulations were in force) or regulated by special laws as they were under the Turks, they are Egyptians, and working together they will doubtless allow past differences to fall into oblivion and in so doing, come to know and respect each other better. When this occurs, and their dissident brethren are assured that acceptance of the claims of the See of Peter, who sent St. Mark to Alexandria, does not imply the abolition of their venerable rites, Catholics will have gone a long way towards the achievement of that "diversity in unity" so dear to the hearts of all lovers of the ancient liturgies which the paternal heart of the common Father of all desires should be preserved, not as antiquarian relics of bygone ages, but as living channels by which Our Lord's greatest gift to His people, Himself, shall be perpetually manifested.

A COMMENT ON THE ROMEWARD MOVEMENT AMONG ANGLICANS FROM ANOTHER ANGLE.¹

" Six years ago, an Anglican friend passed on a copy of the *Bond of Peace*. Since that time, most of the issues have come to hand and I have found them very interesting. That a movement Romewards should exist within the Anglican Church might be supposed to disturb a strong Free Church man, such as I was then. I can well remember being filled with horror on reading a book, with some such title as *The Secret History of the Oxford Movement*, describing the Romeward tendencies of the Oxford Revival, but that was many years ago and I am older, and perhaps wiser, now.

¹ This is published with the kind permission of the editor of *The Bond of Peace*, the quarterly paper of the Society for Catholic Reunion (Anglican)—THE EDITOR.

Quite frankly, though I have felt bound to embrace the Catholic Faith, as held by the Church of England, I have not reached the stage at which I can sever old connexions completely, and I am hoping that I may see the day when my onetime co-religionists will realize all the Catholic Church has to offer them. I write, therefore, as far as possible, from the point of view which I held prior to my conversion to the Church.

Schemes of reunion loom largely on the religious horizon just now. I place little faith in most of them. To a great extent, they fall into two classes: those, like the South India Scheme, which seek to hide fundamental differences under ambiguity, and those which would resolve the Faith into the highest common factor, which, in effect, would resolve it out of being altogether. Neither can be fruitful. The only Faith which will overcome the world is one which is definite, authoritative, and can claim historical continuity. Moreover, the fact is being forced home upon us that only a single, united front can secure headway for Christianity in the modern world.

The formation of a pan-Protestant amalgamation has been advocated in some quarters. It is open to a very grave objection. Between the Romans, Orthodox and Anglo-Catholics there is less difference of opinion than exists between some Protestant bodies, and a pan-Protestant amalgamation would have the inevitable result of producing a far stronger Catholic *bloc*. Christianity, split into two strong opposing divisions would present a far more vivid picture of disruption to the world even than at present. The very strength of the opposing parties would secure this, and that strength, too, would tend both to thrust the two yet further apart and tempt each to waste itself upon the attempted annihilation of the other. It is obvious to anyone, who thinks seriously of reunion, that it cannot really be effective until Christ's will is fulfilled, 'that they all may be one.' It is this fact which emboldens me to write on the subject and to put forward some views (*not entirely my own, for they are shared by friends I have met within my late, and in other, Protestant denominations*) which might be of some interest to Catholic reunionists.

Protestantism, in the past thirty years, has had to face up to the realities of a very grim situation. There is no gainsaying the fact that the drift from religion is a real factor in modern life and that all efforts to stem the tide have proved futile. Moreover, the complexity of modern life has created

the specialist in almost every field of human endeavour, with the result that the average man no longer finds it necessary to think things out for himself. In fact, in most fields of knowledge, he is not mentally equipped to do so. He accepts the findings of others and, knowing nothing of the processes by which results are arrived at, he sees them only as facts of infallible certitude. Modern civilization is built upon them; it appears to work and it manifests many wonders and thus there is no room to doubt their veracity. Doubts, perplexities, rival theories and the recognition of the limitations of knowledge belong to the realm of the specialists. The average man knows nothing of them. He sees only marvels and those things upon which the majority of the specialists have reached agreement. Christianity, and especially Protestant Christianity, presents a very different spectacle to his gaze. There, the conflicting opinions are right in the foreground, the average man is invited to think for himself, to shoulder the task he has relegated to the specialist in every other realm of knowledge and experience and, in effect, to forego the support of that infallibility which he has learnt to rely upon. Protestantism is singularly ill-equipped to meet this modern situation. It replaced an infallible Church by an infallible Bible and then encouraged Higher Criticism to shatter its chosen foundation. Science which, in actual fact, can only reach conclusions by experiment and experience and wherein new knowledge constantly upsets previously accepted principles, has assumed the cloak of infallibility in the eyes of the average man. Christianity, on the contrary, which is revealed truth and, therefore, implies a single, authoritative exposition, is presented to the world as a mere welter of conflicting opinions and, outside Catholicism, makes little or no claim to infallibility. It is small wonder that the drift from religion continues and that there is a growing realization that Christianity, if it is to play any part in the future, must recapture some common source of truth and present a single, authoritative doctrine to the world.

Of late years, the pressure of world events has forced Christian denominations into closer contact with each other. Two important facts have emerged as a result of this contact. First of all, we have discovered that religious bitterness, in past ages, was no respector of the truth. Romanism, which a century ago was openly labelled as pagan idolatry, is, today, regarded as a quite legitimate expression of Christianity. In the second place, we have learnt that it is possible to discuss

our differences without rancour. These are hopeful signs and, by the grace of God, might well be of service.

Very few would now deny that the Papacy played a vital part in the preservation of Christianity throughout the Middle Ages. As the centre of Christian unity, it presented a rock upon which every effort of the world to destroy or pervert the Faith was broken time after time. As I see the course of events shaping themselves now, it seems to me that they will force the issue. A non-spiritual element in Protestantism might affiliate with the world and continue, for a time, as a State-controlled religion, but the truly spiritual in Protestantism cannot do so and will find itself allied with the Papal See. Persecution in Germany brought Catholics and Protestants together. A far greater menace might well bring them into the one fold.

At the moment, the reaction to the world situation is expressing itself in two ways: by the putting forward of schemes for wholesale reunion and by the organization of evangelistic campaigns. In my opinion, the time is not ripe for either. It is quite clear that only a united Christianity can make any appeal in the modern world; it is equally clear that there are real differences which must be resolved before any organic union can be affected. Reunion must come before evangelization. We have learnt to respect the views of our fellow Christians in our recent contacts, we know there is much upon which we are agreed, but the differences must be dealt with. I submit that they cannot be adequately resolved at a council table. That is to leap too far ahead. There must be much spade work done first, and I suggest that the proper place for such is within the Churches and denominations themselves. Let Christianity, as a whole, decide to take a long view of evangelization, let it realize that reunion is the first necessity and let it, then, concentrate upon itself until this first requisite is realized. Let the Churches and denominations consider, seriously, their differences, since these are the vital factors in perpetuating disunity. Let them contrast their own with the expositions and explanations afforded by the *exponents* of other views. (We have been misled too long by *opponents*.) Let them be tested and tried in the light of the need of the world for salvation. Where dogmatic agreement is found in Churches or groups, let them work for union and, gradually, if the task is faced honestly and prayerfully, the difficulties will disappear. In my view, and I speak as I would before my conversion to

the Church, differences of doctrine, whilst they might be of interest to the theologian, do not effect, nor even interest, the average church-goer. The man in the pew is motivated more by custom and fancy than by any dogmatic assertions. It is the organization, the type of service, whether it be sacerdotal or evangelical, which attracts or repels him. It is here, I think, in the realm of organization and ministry, that the real difficulty confronting reunion lies, but I do not think that it is insoluble.

From the earliest days, priest and prophet have been opposed. This, in effect, marks the real difference between Catholicism and Protestantism. Catholicism places the main emphasis upon worship and the Sacraments; Protestantism upon morality and evangelism. But the two need not be in opposition and both will be needed in the years which lie ahead. Catholicism can give to Protestantism that certitude in Faith which the latter has sacrificed, the wonder of worship and the perfection of the Sacraments, Protestantism, in return, can tender that evangelistic zeal, which needs only the fire of a holy mission to set it blazing through the world again. It is on these lines that I hope to see a real union of Christendom accomplished.

Anglican Papalists are, already, in full dogmatic agreement with Rome. As I understand their aims, they claim that the Church of England is part of the Catholic Church, which was severed from the Holy See by the force of secular power. They work for its restoration. For my part, whilst I am in full sympathy, I feel there is truth in Wesley's idea of the necessity for an evangelistic mission working within the framework of the Church and that a duly authorized and commissioned Ministry of the Word could work¹, hand in hand, with the Ministry of the Sacraments in presenting a single, authoritative Faith to the world to the advantage of each, the salvation of the world and the restoration and preservation of the ancient Unity of the Church."

WYLLIE BLEUGH.

¹ Such a Ministry of the Word sprang up in the Catholic Church in the Orders of Friars and still exists.—EDITOR.

E.C.Q. CONFERENCE OCTOBER 25th-27th
AT BLACKFRIARS, OXFORD

The general theme is *Tradition and Scripture*.
The papers are :—

The Fathers on this Subject. By Père L. Bouyer, Cong. Orat.

The Teaching of the Orthodox Church on the Relation of Scripture and Tradition. By Prof. N. Arseniev (Orthodox).

The (Post-Patristic Western) Teaching of the Catholic Church on the Same. By Fr. Sebastian Bullough, O.P.

Bishop Tykhon of Voronezh as an Example of Russian Orthodox Teaching. By N. Gorodetsky (Orthodox).

Anglican Scriptural Theology. By Fr. G. Hebert, S.S.M. (Anglican).

General Chairman. Rev. Victor White, O.P.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

The Political Thought of Richard Hooker. By E. T. Davies, M.A. S.P.C.K. 6s.

Eighteenth Century Piety. By W. K. Lowther Clarke, S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

The Orb and the Cross. By Alec R. Vidler, B.D. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

John Henry Newman. By John Moody. Sheed & Ward. 15s.

A Tribute to Newman. (Ed.) Michael Tierney. Brown & Nolan. 15s.

The religious history of England since the "Reformation" is the history of the progressive loss of religion; once the divinely instituted authority of the Church was repudiated there remained no force which could maintain orthodox teaching in religion or the authority of religion over other spheres of life. The last century has seen this secularization of English life almost completed, and also the return of the Church to attempt to stem the tide and restore what was lost. The books listed above between them give sidelights upon the main stages of the process: Hooker represents the vain effort of the better sort of Anglican of the period of schism to achieve a compromise, to salvage from the wreck

of the "Reformation" a substantial part of the heritage of the Church; the eighteenth century saw the complete failure of this effort made manifest; the nineteenth a new effort to achieve it, leading to the participation of the converts in the revival of the Church, and the perpetuation of the effort of the Established Church to maintain claims and teachings for which it has at bottom no authority but the (now paganized) state, while the secularization of society proceeded apace.

Mr. Davies's little book gives a useful summary of Hooker's doctrine on Church and state against its background of the Puritan movement. This latter was really only the logical outcome of the revolt against the Church, and Hooker had an unenviable task in trying to justify the Anglican church and at the same time refute the Presbyterians. None the less we need not marvel at his blindness to logic when after the experience of centuries there are still many whose position is substantially the same. Those centuries surely should have manifested to all the truth of the Catholic contention of the need for unity and the necessity of a single centre of authority to maintain that unity. The Petrine supremacy is one of the essentials of the Church of Christ falling under Hooker's category of unchangeable law—if "the end for which a law provideth be perpetually necessary, and the way whereby it provideth perpetually most apt, no doubt but that every such law ought for ever to remain unchanged"—even were it not of divine ordinance. This book should be useful to all who want an introduction to one of the most typical and influential of Anglican divines.

Eighteenth Century Piety is disappointing in as much as its title leads one to hope for a different book—a study of the very beautiful personal piety which did exist in the Anglican church even in that epoch, as witness Dr. Johnson. In fact, one gathers from the Preface, "piety" refers rather to Mr. Lowther Clarke's feelings towards his eighteenth century predecessors in the S.P.C.K., and the book is primarily a contribution to the history of that society. It does, however, provide materials for a fuller understanding of the Establishment in the eighteenth century and, if not of the piety, of the benevolent activity for their fellow men of some of its members. The book is not confined to the century—there are essays on the Prayer Book homilies, and a good deal of early nineteenth century matter.

With *The Orb and the Cross*, "a normative study in the relations of Church and state with reference to Gladstone's early writings," we are back in the debates of Hooker. There is an obvious parallel; Gladstone endeavours, as Hooker endeavoured, to defend a heritage of Catholic ideas, but, as an Anglican, the ground is cut away from under his feet. How can any member of a church which owes its existence and its character to the arbitrary act of the state defend a high doctrine of the Church, or defend any conception of the Church's independence? Gladstone knew that "revealed religion derives its strength from its entireness" and that if any portion of revealed truth be sundered from the body of revelation "the portion of truth, which we have torn from the quivering trunk, will but as a severed limb putrefy within our grasp," he knew that "the disintegration of Christendom from one into many communions" had fatal consequences for the relations of Church and state in every country, yet this seems not in the slightest degree to have affected his judgment of the English "Reformation" or of the basis of the Anglican community. It is a distressing feature of Mr. Vidler's book, as of Mr. Davies's, that the modern commentators on Hooker and Gladstone seem as unaware of this aspect of their subject as the authors they are discussing. Mr. Vidler shows the unhappy contrast between the sound theories of Gladstone's early works and the policies which as a statesman he pursued; he comes near suggesting that Gladstone's was in a sense a wasted life; he draws a comparison between Gladstone and Manning, but a more striking one might have been drawn between Gladstone and Newman.

If we are depressed by the power the traditions of schism and heresy still have of blinding Anglicans to the Church of God we may find consolation and grounds for hope in the life of Newman more than in anything else; this shows that all these obstacles can be overcome by one who with a single heart seeks the will of God. Newman no doubt appeared unimportant to most men of his day in comparison with Gladstone, but there is no doubt which is the more important now. Mr. Moody's life is not the major re-estimate of Newman which we might desire at this date, but it is a useful biography considerably briefer than Ward's, which should meet the needs of a wide public desirous of acquiring a reasonably full knowledge of his life. The Irish *Tribute* shows effectively that Newman has a valuable contribution

to make to the guidance of the Christian scholar in many fields. The essays are inevitably slight, that on "the writer and preacher" being painfully so to a lover of the great sermons, but the book deserves the welcome accorded to it on all sides. In Newman we see one who, equal to Gladstone in his appreciation of the practicable, unlike Gladstone grasped not only the trend of the times, but where it would ultimately lead us; and he showed his countrymen the road to salvation; his absolute integrity first led him into the Church of Christ, and within the Church enabled him to face all the problems of his time, many of which are the problems of ours, with an equal wisdom and charity. There is no man better worthy of the study of all of us, whether Anglican or Catholic.

W.T.R.

God With Us. Three Meditations by S. L. Frank, formerly Professor of Philosophy at the University of Moscow. Translated from the Russian by Natalie Duddington, M.A. Jonathan Cape, London, 1946. Pp. 296.

Man's approach to God is a perennial theme and one that goes back to the earliest of philosophies. It is even used as a persuasive argument to our first parents "and you shall be as gods." All created beings by their very nature partake in some measure of the perfections of the Creator. He it is who is the Exemplar of all things. Such a participation by no means argues identity of being or perfection, but is rather the stamp or seal placed on the work by the hand of the craftsman. It is none the less a real participation and it is here that we have the whole purpose of Creation; that all things should reflect the Divine Perfection; that all things by their very multiplicity and difference of perfections should shine forth as facets of that utter simplicity and unity which is the Divine Essence. Such a reflection is however of the Power of God and not of the Nature as such. It is true that Essence (Power) and Nature in God are one and indivisible in themselves, the same identical reality, but their formal concepts are distinct. How then can man participate in the Divine Nature, a fact of the possibility of which there can be no doubt. Here there must be a new kind of participation, a sharing in something which transcends all the perfections of the Divinity made manifest in the visible created universe. It must be a sharing in that inner sanctuary of the Divinity; in that which makes Him to be God, the

source of all that activity which is eternally flowing forth in those two streams which we call divine processions. Such a participation is possible to man and the means of attaining to it is at hand in Sanctifying Grace, a real physical formal communication of the Divine Nature. This communication is a free gift on the part of God, an indwelling of the Holy Spirit in each individual who participates in the merits of Christ's Passion. Only in this way can we attain to God; by personal, individual union with the Blood of Christ, by a cleansing in this Redemptive stream made possible by the Redeemer Himself; a sacramental cleansing and re-birth by water and the Holy Spirit. Nor is this a mere cleansing but also an infusion of Divine Life, of Divine Activity whereby man is able to work on that supernatural plane to which he was raised by God at the Creation. For this divine work man requires three fundamental aids which are infused at his re-birth, Faith, Hope, Charity; three aids which he can only obtain by this method, by water and the Holy Spirit.

Now Dr. Frank deals specifically with the first of these aids. He treats of the nature of Faith; of Faith as a religious experience; of Faith in relation to Authority and finally in the second part of his book on Faith in practice. It is as well to say in the beginning that the author's treatment is penetrating and complete; a work redolent of the deepest thought and earnestness; a work which at first sight one could recommend to all who seek God. Unfortunately, speaking as a Catholic, the work is vitiated from the very outset by the rejection of what Dr. Frank calls the traditional idea of Faith. For this he substitutes what is in reality a purely subjective notion, almost a personal revelation of God to the individual simply and solely by means of religious experience. We do not deny the validity of religious experience; of the intimate commerce of God and the soul. All this is to be found in Mystical writers of unimpeachable orthodoxy. But all this is of necessity posterior to the primary fundamental contact of the soul with God whereby He is communicated to the soul. This primary fundamental contact can only be achieved by using the method laid down by God in His Divine economy, and that means is not just religious experience, it is something more, something simply and primarily objective, infused Faith. It is not just an acceptance of human testimony, not just a bowing to an intellectual judgment. All this is a preamble to contact with Christ, who alone can complete the union by the sending

of the Spirit in Baptism ; who alone can give that divine free gift, Faith.

A purely individual religious experience being substituted for this gift, Dr. Frank's attitude to Authority ; to Faith in practice, follows by logical sequence. For him, the Christian is always in a state of potential rebellion. In actual practice, despite the author's assertions to the contrary, this religious experience is the ultimate criterion of the validity of the relationship of the soul with God. The believer must of necessity be an Antigone. Now obviously Dr. Frank is urging Antigone as a type of one standing firm and immovable on the side of Piety, Religion, as against unjust aggression. He might have cited the example of St. Peter with greater accuracy. But "*omnis comparatio claudicat.*" Antigone is more than lame. In her case it was a conflict of Piety, of the virtue of Religion, with what Plato would call *δημοτική τε καὶ πολιτικὴ ἀρετή*—and she was in this perfectly justified. She was asserting the higher claim of a greater virtue. But with regard to the relation of religious experience to Authority as embodied in the Church there is here a relationship to an Authority divinely constituted to deal *ex professo* with matters of Piety and Religion. Any subjective religious experience must thereby be subject to this higher authority. The power of discerning spirits is resident in that Authority ; it can only reside in the individual at the best as a charisma, and St. Paul himself insists on the subjection of charismata to higher authority. Dr. Frank's view must in the end open the way to anarchy and to the impossibility of carrying out that Faith in practice of which he has treated so fully and so admirably in his last section. Here again there is much to recommend, but here again there are pitfalls. Grace can and must provide active channels ; it must overflow into every part of man's life, but it does not produce merely ethical goodness. It is more than that ; it is a pouring forth of Divine Activity through man, which returns through man to God.

On reading philosophical-theological works by members of the Orthodox churches, an almost inevitable impression is given of the lack of synthesis of the Academy and the Lyceum. Now we are informed that Dr. Frank has been mainly influenced by Plotinus. This is evident in the whole of the present work. St. Augustine himself was under this influence, but surely in so far as Plotinus attempted a synthesis of Plato and the Peripatetics. It is not enough to take one's

stand on the Exemplar of Plato, on a metaphysic based on the Ethos of Socrates. There is need of the Individual Form as it were of Aristotle. It is not enough for man to share in the perfections of the Divine Essence, to reflect the Divine Exemplar. It is imperative that man shares also in the Divine Nature, that he, as an individual, is informed by Grace ; that Divine Nature becomes by participation, accidentally indeed, the "form" of the individual, the source of his activity whether immanent or transient. Thus when man is reacting on his fellow creatures he does so by virtue of his new nature by which he has truly become like God. But the giving or "creating" of this form is, by analogy with all other creation, the sole work of God. He alone can give it ; He alone can ordain the means whereby we shall attain to this gift. The divine commission is ultimately to the Church, not to the individual, whatever his religious experience may appear to be.

DOM ANSELM THATHER.

History of the Patriarchs of the Egyptian Church. By Sawirus ibn al-Mukaffa. Vol. II, Part 1. Translated and annotated by Yassa 'Abd al-Masih and O. H. E. Burmester, D.Ph. (Coptic Archæological Society, Cairo. n.p.)

After being cut off from the research and publishing of other countries for so long a time the above publication is a specially welcome sight. It is a fascicle of the History of the Patriarchs of the Egyptian Church ("The History of the Holy Church") of Sawirus ibn al-Mukaffa, which has been described as "a kind of *Liber pontificalis* of the Coptic Church," and forms one of the texts-and-documents series of the Coptic Archæological Society. The book shows no sign of war-time austerity. It is an imperial 8vo. of 175 pages, wrapped, excellently printed on good paper, and contains an English translation followed by the Arabic text. The text used is MS. Hist. 1 in the library of the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo, collated with MS. Hist. 13 in the library of the Coptic patriarchate.

The work of Sawirus (Severus) of Al-Asmunin and his continuers is a source-book for Coptic history. This instalment comprises the biographies of the three patriarchs who were in office at Alexandria from 849 to 880, Khael II, Cosmas I and Shenuti I, a time when the Mohammedan rule was peculiarly oppressive. The librarian of the Coptic Museum,

Yassa 'Abd al-Masih Effendi, and Dr. Burmester together have produced a work of scholarship which must be of great utility to the specialist and the student.

X.Y.Z.

Flame in the Snow. By Julia de Beausobre. Constable. Pp. 168. 10s.

Having read Mr. Dobbie-Bateman's translation of St. Seraphim of Sarov "Concerning the aim of the Christian Life" (S.P.C.K., 1935) with thirty-four pages of introduction, in which the historical facts of Seraphim's life are given, this dramatized life of the saint seemed lame and disappointing. But on the second reading of Madam de Beausobre's book I changed my mind. The author has caught and can depict the feel of the country and people of her Russia. She intersperses the narrative of Seraphim with vivid allusions to the secular history of the time. In a word, she makes her subjects live, and live in their own period.

In addition to this there is the analysis of the Russian character. And more important still, the analysis of the prayer-life of Seraphim. The book is divided into "Godward-bound" and "return manward," the completion of the work of grace in the formation of a hermit. It is a fascinating study. One would like to see a cheaper edition.

B.W.

The Doctrine of the Unity of the Church in the Works of Khomyakov and Moehler. By Serge Bolshakoff. S.P.C.K. Pp. 333. 18s.

We welcome this book as a valuable addition to the books of reference on matters concerned with the Eastern Churches. The book is very well documented: footnotes, bibliographical notes to each chapter, and an index.

The title, however, raises expectations that are not borne out in the book itself. The whole is really a study of Khomyakov, while Moehler is confined to one chapter, and even there he is considered only in his relations with the former. But in spite of this defect the study is of great interest and valuable.

Khomyakov is studied in a very complete way: his life, as a philosopher, his relations with William Palmer, his doctrine on the Church and here it is good to have the comment of archbishop Germanos: "I am sure that Khomyakov misunderstood what was said in the Synodal Encyclical

of the Orthodox patriarchs in 1848 about the faithful being the defenders of the Dogma." (Quoted from a letter-foreword.) His controversial treatises are also studied and his position in relation to modern movements towards a united Christendom.

The study is packed with comments on and analysis of the important and unimportant characters of the period. By this, we think Dr. Bolshakoff has given us an impartial and very useful appreciation of Alexis Khomyakov and his place in present Orthodox theological thought and so the position this plays in the study of the problem of reunion.

K.F.E.W.

The Far East must be Understood. By H. van Straelen, S.V.D. Luzac & Co., London. Pp. 151. 10s. 6d.

This is a most opportune and important book. Opportune because it is now self-evident that the future peace of the world must depend on a real understanding of the peoples of the West with those of the East. Important, because Father van Straelen has some home truths to tell the future diplomats of the Western nations and some important facts to present the public in his chapter on "Information and Misinformation" where press correspondents are criticized.

The whole book is the considered opinion of one who has not only spent years among the Chinese and Japanese, but who schooled himself to absorb the traditions and rhythm of the Far East. He has also allowed his manuscript to be examined by Oriental experts before he sent it for publication. It should be read by all who are alive to the present vital turning point in world history. There are thirty-seven pages given to what the author entitles "towards a bibliography." Here is no mere list of books, but a good comment on all books recommended is given. The chapter can be treated as a reference library.

The book is indeed critical, but it is constructive and humble criticism.

B.W.

The Church of England and the Eastern Orthodox Church. By Michael Ramsey. S.P.C.K. 4d.

This pamphlet of Canon M. Ramsey is excellent and we think a most needed reminder as to the importance of the Orthodox Church in any future reunion work.

The author states the case thus: "that our familiar divisions have their root in the original schism between

East and West, that in unity with the East there lies a remedy for many of the problems and perplexities of the whole Church, that the Church of England has a special debt and obligation in the matter, and that the present crisis in Church and world summons our thoughts *Eastwards*." This is largely how we see the problem of Christian Unity, including the part Anglicans can play in working for this end.

Canon Ramsey fails to see Rome's true position. Here is a Catholicism that embraces both East and West (see pp. 7 and 12), not only in theory, but by increasingly urging her Uniates, and Latins too, to consider not only the Oriental Liturgies in all their purity of rite but also to study the age long traditions of the Eastern Fathers of the Church.

B.W.

The Swedish Church. By the Rev. H. M. Waddams. S.P.C.K.
70 pages. 6s.

The scope of this little book is indicated by the author in his preface where he states that it "represents an attempt to provide a simple summary of information about the Church of Sweden, as an encouragement for ordinary churchmen in England to take more personal interest in this neighbouring Church." Mr. Waddams is concerned almost exclusively with the National Church of Sweden. He is an Anglican writing for Anglicans. These facts may perhaps explain that whilst the greater part of the book is devoted to the period 1523 to the present day, the period 829 to 1523 (seven hundred years) is dismissed in ten pages under the heading "Early Developments."

Whilst we do not question the obvious sincerity of the author we may perhaps permit ourselves to ask whether it be satisfactory to deal with so long and difficult a period in so short a space. The unwary reader who has no opportunity or maybe inclination to verify the data supplied or to supply the facts omitted may easily carry away a lopsided and ill-conceived notion of Sweden's Christian history. It is clear that the writer is anxious to promote union amongst those who profess loyalty to Christ, and the information he gives about recent movements in Sweden is illuminating and useful, but is it possible to think seriously of a united Christendom without reference to that See of which the first Apostle to Sweden, St. Anschar, was a legate?

D.G.B.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Oxford University Press : *Origen*. By Dr. W. R. Inge.
Dent & Sons : *Ethiopia Under Haile Selassie*. By C. Sandford.
Washington D.C., U.S.A. : *Marriage Legislation for Catholics of the Oriental rites in U.S.A. and Canada*. By Rev. J. F. Marbach.

REVIEWS

International Christian Press and Information Service. (Nos. 27, 28). Geneva, August 1946.

OBITUARY

JOSEPH WILLIAMS MCPHERSON.

On 22nd January last, Joseph Williams McPherson died at his villa in the village of Bein el Sarayat, near Cairo. In his eighty-second year, Bimbashi McPherson had, in the forty-five years which he spent in Egypt, seen changes which are given to few observers to witness and record.

In his early days in the Land of the Holy Family's Exile—as he liked to call it—his mind, attuned to the classical and historical, quickly appreciated the unique position which the Eastern Churches, Catholic and dissident, occupied in a Moslem country, and to the end of his long life, he kept this love for them—one might almost say that his devotion hastened his end, for on 18th January, the Eve of the Coptic Epiphany, he went into Cairo for the Blessing of the Waters, overtaxed a tired but still eager heart, and returned home to die peacefully at his beloved villa “Porziuncula.”

McPherson was a man of many interests ranging from liturgy to philately, from rowing to hospitality—his luncheon parties were famous and the occasions for meetings of men and women of all those races and religions which make Egypt the paradise of the student of human nature in all its manifestations.

To be taken by him round the churches of Old Cairo—or, to give the ancient walled city its older name, Babylon—or those in the bazaar quarters, the Faggalah, the Hamzawi, was an experience which could never be repeated too often; he knew every spot of interest and would point out, but only to the elect, the places sanctified by the Holy Family.

In the forty-five years in which Egypt was his home, he

travelled far and wide, often on mule or donkey (an animal on which almost to the end he could be seen riding amidst the crowded traffic of Cairo) but never by motor car which, with the telephone and radio he disliked and declaimed as destroyers of simple life and pleasures : Asia Minor, Greece, Turkey and most of the countries of the Mediterranean littoral were visited and wherever he went he put up at the little inn, or at some monastery, sought out and usually found the *genius loci* and then made himself as well acquainted with the locality and its people as time would permit.

All his wanderings, and much else, are recorded in a series of letters which he began on his way out to Egypt in 1901. Written for the private reading of his five elder brothers, these letters are a treasury of information on every subject, place and person he encountered in the forty years which they cover. He loved to describe things exactly as he saw them—nobody else might see them as he did but that did not matter to him—extravagant in his praises of the beautiful, spiritual in his handling of matters religious scathing and always forthright in his denunciation of humbug and falsehood, he gives not only the most valuable and readable information but a very accurate portrait of himself in all his writings.

Unfortunately he published very little ; a few articles after he retired from the Egyptian Government service in 1924, an Arabic-English dictionary of Scientific Terms, and one delightful volume, *The Moulids of Egypt* in which a life's study of the native feasts, fasts and festivals, Christian and Moslem, religious and secular, is set down, often in no uncertain terms. Readers of *Moulids*¹ will quickly grasp the love which its author had for the old customs of Egypt, his hatred of modern innovations and of changes which he considered savoured of oppression of the simple fellahin or a deprivation of his harmless pleasures.

Few Englishmen have known, as he knew, the natives in his simplicity—he joined in their moulids and assisted at the Coptic services (as well as those of other rites) and was most emphatic in maintaining that if the faithful of the Eastern rites can keep to their liturgical offices as tenaciously as they still do, we Latins, there and in the West should hang our heads in shame at our almost complete abandon-

¹ *The Moulids of Egypt*, J. W. McPherson, M.A. (Oxon.), B.Sc. (Bristol), A.R.C.Sc., etc., is obtainable from Messrs. Luzac.

ment of the Divine Office in favour of modern vernacular devotions, for most of which he had irreverent, but very apt nicknames. (It was not until a month before his death that he ever heard Compline sung in Egypt and wrote that "it is the Lord's doing and it is marvellous in my ears.")

Bimbashi McPherson became a Catholic whilst studying in Dublin and went on to Oxford where he took his degree in Natural Sciences in 1890. Ten years of scholastic life in England preceded his appointment in the Egyptian Ministry of Education in 1901. A fervent Catholic, an ardent Imperialist who saw in Egypt and elsewhere the Englishman as the sole champion of the humble working classes, he was in many ways a puzzling character of boyish enthusiasms, mordant criticisms and wide learning.

The Carmelites of Choubrah, whose Basilica of the Little Flower was the first to be dedicated to her honour in Africa, counted him as a con-frater whose presence at their feasts, and theirs at his villa, were always welcome.

The writer of this memoir had the happiness of spending a fortnight with "Mac" in the autumn of 1945: they had not met since 1939 and the time flew in talk on many subjects but always worked its way back to Eastern Churches. One Sunday we went to the little Melkite church of Our Lady of Peace, where the Liturgy was beautifully celebrated in Arabic. Old Mac, with that reverence for the clergy which was so characteristic of him, hesitated to speak to the young celebrant after the liturgy but eventually did so, kneeling to ask his blessing and kiss the hand of the bearded priest. The writer went on to the Catholic Armenian Cathedral where, but for the vestments, an inaudible liturgy gave no indication that it was not a Roman Mass. Old Mac, when he was told, had much to say on the subject of latinization and its evils, and went on to regret the passing from several Melkite churches of the former ways of doing things: he was hurt by the modernization and saw nothing good in it—an opinion with which the writer agrees wholeheartedly.

To McPherson, the retention of the Oriental Liturgies and Offices in their unabridged form was the essential starting point for reunion with the dissident churches and he never failed to point out to English Catholic visitors to Egypt the absurdity and, as he termed it, banality of those who suggested that nobody can be really a Catholic unless he belongs to the Latin rite.

During the war, cut off almost entirely from his relatives in England, he wrote his "Swan Song"—a beautiful pæan of thanksgiving to Almighty God for the blessings of a long and happy life—the concluding lines, quoted below, are his epitaph—and may readers of EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY have his soul "in memory eternal."

"But a flower-lined resting place, and flowers above. And if friends wish to place anything more enduring than flowers, let it be engraved with the old greeting of FAREWELL—the one word—*Χαῖρε* and should anything further be added, let it be—'Sanctus Michael repreaesentet animam ejus in lucem sanctam.' "

IBN QUMMUS.

THE METROPOLITAN EULOGIUS

The metropolitan Eulogius Georgievsky died at Paris in August, 1946. R.I.P.

He was both a politician and a churchman. In 1905, as a young bishop, he was a member of two successive Dumas. He became archbishop of Volhynia and Zhilomir, and during 1914-15 he tried to win the Galician Ukrainians over to the Russian Orthodox Church. It is, however, as exarch of Western Europe, to which charge he had been appointed by the patriarch Tikhon and which position he also was to hold later under the *Œcumene* patriarch, that he is best known.

With Paris as his centre, he built up the Russian Church in exile. Here he established the famous Theological Academy and was a true bishop to his flock to whom anybody had free access at any time.

He was interested in the young generation and in the problems of Christian Unity. He encouraged the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius. He also showed an interest in the work of Mgr. Van Caloen for the Russians in the neighbourhood of Nice and visited the little Benedictine residence at Cap d'Antibes. Similarly he visited the hostel for Russian refugees founded at Louvain by Cardinal Mercier which was under the charge of a Jesuit Father.

Metropolitan Eulogius, in spite of the difficulties caused by politics and rivalries, aimed at remaining if possible [and there was a time in 1927 when he deemed it impossible] in communion with the patriarch of Moscow, while at the

same time maintaining freedom for the Church. In September 1945 he helped to bring about a reconciliation with Moscow through the metropolitan Nicolas of Krutitsy. It remains to be seen whether this ideal can be kept to in practice. Archbishop Photius from Moscow, who was already in Paris on account of Mgr. Eulogius being in ill health, has taken over the affairs of the exarchate. The patriarch of Constantinople still claims jurisdiction over the Russian Orthodox in Western Europe!

Essays in Reconstruction

Edited by DOM RALPH RUSSELL, O.S.B.

10/6 net

To those whom Belsen and the atomic bomb have tempted to despair of a better world, this book will bring guidance and fresh hope. After analysing the causes of our present troubles, it seeks to remedy the dangers of planning without principles by recalling us to a human order based on right reason and inspired by Christian faith.

The Making of Europe

By CHRISTOPHER DAWSON

16/- net

Mr. Dawson gives a very complete survey of the remarkable achievements of Byzantine and Islamic culture, which are so often neglected or misunderstood by students of mediæval European history. In this, as in the main subject of the book, it has been his aim to view history from inside as a living spiritual process instead of as an external study of an inorganic mass of dead facts and past events.

A Sketch of Mediæval Philosophy

By D. J. B. HAWKINS

6/- net

One of the reasons why scholastic philosophy fails to make its due effect on the contemporary mind is that its atmosphere and terminology are so remote from those of today. The modern man needs an historical introduction to the mediæval achievement in philosophy if he is to appreciate its meaning and importance.

PLEASE ORDER FROM YOUR BOOKSELLER

SHEED & WARD
110-111 Fleet Street, E.C.4.